United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

9th
PLENARY MEETING

29 September 1993
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: INSANALLY
(Guyana)

The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 127 (*continued*)

SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS (ARTICLE 19 OF THE CHARTER) (A/48/414/Add.3)

The PRESIDENT: Before turning to the item on our agenda for this meeting, I should like to draw the Assembly's attention to document A/48/414/Add.3. In a letter contained in that document the Secretary-General informs me that since the issuance of his communications dated 21, 24 and 27 September 1993 Mali has made the necessary payment to reduce its arrears below the amount specified in Article 19 of the Charter.

May I take it that the Assembly duly takes note of this information?

It was so decided.

ADDRESS BY THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF BOLIVIA, MR. GONZALO SANCHEZ DE LOZADA

The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from Spanish)*: The Assembly will first hear an address by the Constitutional President of the Republic of Bolivia.

Mr. Gonzalo Sanchez de Lozada, Constitutional President of the Republic of Bolivia, was escorted into the General Assembly Hall.

The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from Spanish)*: On behalf of the General Assembly I have the honor to welcome to the United Nations the Constitutional President of the Republic of Bolivia, His Excellency Mr. Gonzalo Sanchez de Lozada, and to invite him to address the Assembly.

President SANCHEZ de LOZADA *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I should like to extend greetings to the President of the General Assembly, Ambassador Samuel Insanely of Guyana, to the former President, Stoyan Ganev of Bulgaria, and to Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali. I congratulate them on their active commitment to the principles of peace, justice, human development and international law.

I should also like to greet the Heads of State and representatives of Member States who are gathered here in this historic Hall.

Despite having the seventh highest rate of hyperinflation in the history of mankind, Bolivia has been a pioneer in the structural reforms that began in 1985 with the advent of democracy and freedom - reforms that were carried out without limiting human rights but by making major sacrifices. I should like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the President of our country during that period, Dr. Victor Paz Estenssoro and, on behalf of all Bolivians, to pay a special tribute to his statesmanlike leadership.

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, Room C-178, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

93-86635 (E)

Distr. GENERAL

A/48/PV.9
13 October 1993

ENGLISH

In retrospect, this may not seem so great a task: Reining in the economic crisis and bringing about peaceful change in conditions of freedom and liberty are activities that are being accomplished in many countries in Latin America and elsewhere in the world. The situation in Russia, for example, reminds us of the difficulty of achieving consensus and legitimacy in governing a society in crisis, a society in which change is necessary.

Bolivia's course has required daring and imagination. We have not shrunk from calling upon our people to make sacrifices and shoulder additional burdens. But we are profoundly alarmed, however, when we see so many countries embarking on the road to democracy and change and attempting to achieve stable growth and development with social justice and when we then note that no corresponding efforts are being made in the developed world.

The end of the cold war lit a beacon of hope, but we are surprised that it has not engendered an increase in international cooperation and solidarity. There was greater cooperation during the era of confrontation because of the desire to defend third-world countries against the communist threat and to replace the cold war with relations built on solidarity and development. Today, on the contrary, poor countries are faced with cuts in assistance, the prices of our raw materials continue to plummet, and protectionism is on the rise. Indeed, in real terms the current prices of tin, tungsten, antimony, coffee, rubber and petroleum are even lower than they were in 1930, during the great depression.

It is difficult to see on this bleak horizon how we are going to solve our problems: the migration from rural to urban areas, and from cities to the developed world; the increase in drug trafficking and the phenomenon of poor people being virtually forced to destroy nature in order to survive. That creates a vicious circle, with ever-deepening poverty.

The paradox of our times is that, in a world that is growing ever richer in overall terms, poverty is on the increase. There is a wider disparity between the "haves" and the "have nots". The precarious stability born of internal social and economic deficiencies must be tackled by all of us. There is also an urgent need for basic changes in how we face the problem of solidarity and the development of the community of nations and human societies.

Developed countries must realize that sooner or later the present situation rewards no one and injures everyone. I truly believe that we must have a clear awareness of the fact that population growth, the doubling of the population, the destruction of the environment, the production of illegal drugs and the trafficking in them, the migration from poor countries to rich countries are problems that will affect not only those countries but the world at large.

The solution is greater development. We know that when people's incomes rise, when women are educated and when there is social justice, population growth rates also change.

We know that in order to restore balance between the environment and society we need educated people who can put to use their special heritage and knowledge of living in harmony with nature - as is the case in our country.

Just as we had to learn that nature can punish us when we harm it, the time has come for all of us, developed and undeveloped, to become aware that it is unacceptable that the rich of the world should become ever more wealthy while the poor are becoming poorer.

As we know, the solution is not just to hand out money or aid. But there is no other way to achieve our goal if we do not change old ideas. The motto should be "Trade, not aid". Yet it would seem that the fate of the underdeveloped world is "no trade and no aid", which is absolutely unacceptable to us all if we wish to create a new, more just and peaceful society.

With the passing of time solutions will be even more costly and more difficult in human terms and in social and economic terms. What we need, I believe, is greater foresight on the part of those who are guiding the world's destiny. They must find solutions that are truly effective.

I am not saying that we should repeat the past. But in the past there were plans such as the Marshall Plan that helped donors and recipients alike. We need similar approaches. We look forward with great expectation to the free trade agreement among Canada, the United States and Mexico. We congratulate President Clinton on his commitment to struggling against the forces of protectionism in his country and elsewhere in North America to trying to forge ahead.

As a small developing country, Bolivia views all this with hope, and as a commitment that we will be able to

sell our products to the developing countries rather than only sending them people.

We look forward to a speedy and successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round, as we believe that the freedom of opportunity to produce is the only hope for our societies. The children of the world ask only that their parents be able to work and bring home their daily bread. But that happens only when a country - a society, a world - stands together and gives everyone equal access and opportunity.

We are not asking for special treatment; we are not asking just for help. We are asking to be allowed to work and to export, and not to be obliged just to export the most talented and vigorous people of our societies to the developed world.

In Bolivia we are trying to forge ahead with projects using foreign capital and the participation of our people. We are a very poor people. Our country knows that it needs technology and capital, and during the coming years we hope to embark on an ambitious but feasible plan.

This plan has three pillars: capitalization, democratization and popular participation.

First, we wish to invite foreign capital to come to develop technology and use fresh resources in order to enrich the heritage of our State enterprises. We do not want to sell our heritage, and we do not want only the participation of States.

Secondly, 50 per cent of those enterprises and 50 per cent of the stock must be owned by all Bolivians so that these Bolivians can participate in the enterprises and feel included in the process of economic development.

Thirdly, many people ask "How can we give free goods to uneducated people who do not know how to read or write, who have different ethnic and cultural backgrounds?" The truth is that in Bolivia many people do not know how to read but do know how to count. They know what it means to participate. They know what it means to feel they are taking part in the fortunes of the country. With their participation we wish to bring to poor neighbourhoods and communities the health and education the people there need so that they can share in management.

The coming millennium will no longer find that representative democracy is enough. It must be participatory democracy. People want to participate and they will do so very well when it comes to matters that directly affect their lives and futures.

We believe that with participation of this kind our societies' meagre resources will yield greater productivity. Demand will grow, which will make it possible for our societies to forge ahead.

But in Bolivia participation is not a mere word. For the first time in 500 years, a man has emerged from an indigenous ethnic group to become Acting President of our country. To the Bolivian people Victor Hugo Cárdenas is not only an Aimara Indian, a person from the countryside, but a great professional and outstanding intellectual. He typifies our desire that all of our citizens take part in our society. We want to do away with age-old injustices. We want to bring about change - to bring people in, not keep them out. We want to create unity while respecting the diversity of opinion not only on ecology and the environment but also on cultural, geographical and racial problems.

We believe that this determination to include - not exclude -people is helping build a society in which there is change with order, and order with change. And although we are among the poorest countries in Latin America - indeed, in the world - we believe that we stand as an example of the fact that it is possible to live with social peace and to regain stability, growth and social justice within the general framework of a democratic society. In Bolivia, democracy works because people seek consensus; they seek respect, and they are accepting of diversity.

This process should allow us to arrive at a situation conducive to dealing with employment, education and health care, and, most importantly, the rural sector, where the greatest degree of poverty prevails and where the people are among the poorest in the world.

Dynamic growth would, of course, reduce the need to cultivate coca leaves. We in Bolivia have succeeded in reducing by 50 percent the amount of land used for the cultivation of these leaves. We accomplished this without the guerrilla violence that accompanies narcotrafficking, and without the cartels that are in place in the country. While we are undoubtedly making progress in this area, we are well aware of the fact that the only alternative development activity to this is light industry for export

purposes. There is no use telling the Bolivian peasant, as I said earlier, to stop producing drugs and instead plant coffee when the price of coffee has dropped to half its former price, or to produce cacao when no one wants cacao - or rubber. Experience of alternative crops emphasizes the vital importance of enabling countries such as Bolivia - especially Bolivia - to export their products to the developed countries in the form of manufactured goods, rather than having them export the scourge of harmful drugs to the rest of humankind. We will continue, nevertheless, to fight against drug trafficking because we have made a commitment not only to our people but also to humankind. Though we are poor, we are very happy to see that new efforts are being made to reduce demand. What we want to do is reduce supply. We wish to eliminate this business, with all its attendant dangers - social, moral, legal and institutional. Indeed, we have chosen the zero-option. We expect to be successful, with or without help. But we are more likely to be successful if we enjoy the support, cooperation and understanding of the rest of the world, which is, after all, affected by this terrible scourge.

Ours is an ambitious project, to be sure, but it is feasible. We recognize that the principal responsibility for this plan rests with Bolivians. We are not just waiting for someone to help us. No, we know what all the peoples of the world know, that hunger cannot wait, that solutions have to be found by oneself. But, in all sincerity, I think it will be very difficult to overcome these problems without international cooperation. There must be some signal from the outside that assistance will not come to an end as barriers to trade mount.

Bolivia has made a great commitment to the environment. We have done so because our poverty stems partly from our neglect of this problem. We have allowed poverty increasingly to justify destruction of our natural resources in our daily activities. We do have a great plan - a plan of international significance, not just to resolve our balance-of-payments problems, not just to create an industrial centre that could be the basis of the energy that we need, but to see to it that environmental pollution is reduced. That plan calls for construction, with Brazil, of a pipeline that would bring Bolivian gas to the San Pablo market. With cheap, non-polluting energy, used in industry and in cars, we can contribute to fundamentally reducing pollution in Latin America at its source, for the benefit and development of Bolivia, Brazil and the entire world.

Human rights must be the emblem of the new world community, and we must see to it that the right to development within social justice is achievable. It is not just a gift that we are asking for. We are asking for an opportunity. The United Nations is changing. It has to change; the world has changed. After the great confrontation of the cold-war period, we must deal with all the harm this war caused, especially in the Third World. We have to reorient global solidarity, not just in terms of assistance, but we must accept a concept that is truly very simple and logical. Some countries become rich when they do business, when they engage in trade with other rich countries. To believe that a man is rich because everybody else is poor is a holdover from the past. The great lesson of our time is that the only way to generate wealth is to help people break the shackles of poverty.

We welcome the agreement between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization. It marks the beginning of a new era of peace and of a new spirit of global justice and dialogue between nations facing historic circumstances. The mutual recognition of the inadmissibility of acquiring territory through war is a great stride forward, as is the great and historic lesson that, even in regions where territorial disputes so stubbornly persist, civilized dialogue, common sense and humanity can yield results and can bring people together rather than keeping them apart.

Recently, in the heart of Latin America, we reunited two countries - Paraguay and Bolivia - that 61 years ago were split apart by war and have now decided to forge a common destiny. This has had a great impact on us, because, since the handshake - since the agreement between the two countries - in our country the veterans of the Chaco war have marched carrying the flag of Paraguay. If those who fought, whose comrades died, are prepared to forget, how could we not do likewise?

These enlightening examples of how the most bitter conflicts can be resolved evoke in us a sincere desire that the same spirit should guide the search for a final solution to Bolivia's land-locked status, which has lasted 114 long years. Many people say: "How can you be claiming something that you lost 114 years ago?" I reply that we have a great deal of patience; our people waited 500 years for their lands to be given back to them, for them to win back their country and their right to participate in society. I believe that injustice is not prescribed for us; we shall continue to make our claim, through the use of reason and never by force. We shall continue to claim our right of access to the sea until it is granted, until the sea runs dry.

When it does, there will be no further problem and we shall make no further claims, but I believe that it really would be an affront to go on blocking this historic coming together - which two fraternal peoples are demanding - if at the Government level, at the level of leadership, we continue to discuss something to which both countries already want to find a solution. Solutions are possible; miracles do happen, but we have seen that miracles are the result of work and imagination, and in this we are committed, without aggressiveness, coolly and calmly, to doing whatever we can, as creatively as we can manage, to find solutions that will meet the challenge and the expectations of this new world in which we are living, and to bring about the change that we require.

In these times of change, we must rely on our own creativity. We know the importance of one's own efforts. But at the same time we want others in this world to stand by us in solidarity, and at least give us the opportunity to show what we can do.

And we must move ahead in security along the new paths required by history, and we ask, and shall try to ensure, always and with renewed vigour, that the path chosen is the path of solidarity, well-being, and fraternal relations between peoples and countries.

The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from Spanish)*: On behalf of the General Assembly, I should like to thank the Constitutional President of the Republic of Bolivia for the statement he has just made.

Mr. Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada, Constitutional President of the Republic of Bolivia, was escorted from the General Assembly Hall.

AGENDA ITEM 9 *(continued)*

GENERAL DEBATE

ADDRESS BY MRS. KIM CAMPBELL, PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now hear an address by the Prime Minister of Canada.

Mrs. Kim Campbell, Prime Minister of Canada, was escorted to the rostrum.

The PRESIDENT: I have great pleasure in welcoming the Prime Minister of Canada, The Right Honourable Kim Campbell, and inviting her to address the General Assembly.

Mrs. CAMPBELL (Canada): It has been an extraordinary year since the General Assembly met last year. We have seen breakthroughs in two areas - South Africa and the Middle East - which have bedevilled the international community for decades. Bringing both to a successful conclusion will be hard, but we have good reasons for optimism. Canada applauds the courage and foresight of the parties involved, and pledges that it will continue to do its part in promoting further advances.

But, at the same time, we have also seen tragedies - in Somalia, Bosnia, Angola and elsewhere - which have, thus far, defied our best efforts to bring peace.

It is against this background, of hope renewed and hopes dashed, that I wish to speak about the United Nations central vocation: the defence and promotion of peace and security and the conditions in which they can thrive. It is a Canadian vocation as well.

Since United Nations peace-keeping was invented in 1956 by Lester Pearson, we have been there; sweating it out in the field, taking casualties, doing the tough work for peace, in partnership with a growing number of other Member States. Since 1956, Canada has fielded almost 100,000 men and women in United Nations operations in every corner of the world. That contribution has been a costly one for us, not least in lives lost. None the less, it is a contribution which has been a symbol of pride to most Canadians, a tangible expression of our national quest for a better world.

Canadians speak from experience born of commitment. We see the changes which must be made and the principles which must remain immutable. The world is hungry for multilateral solutions to conflict and war. This is our time, the United Nations moment. We are living through decisive political change. Cold war certainties have given way, but in their place we have unpredictability and instability - a political unease about our future, uncertainty about where collective endeavours can take us. Most countries feel more secure militarily, but our citizens, in their personal lives, often feel less secure about their well-being, for themselves and for generations to come.

But this broader perspective must not obscure the very real military dangers which remain: excessive accumulations of conventional arms; the proliferation of

weapons of mass destruction - chemical, biological and nuclear; and conflict and human misery created by the breakdown of civil and political society within States and across fragile and often new borders.

The world has learned some hard lessons in recent years. First, we have learned that our security is interdependent. Within each specific area of concern - whether military, economic, environment or health - no nation can stand alone. We are all affected, positively and negatively, by developments beyond our borders. And our own actions, within our own countries, inevitably resonate throughout the wider community of nations.

Secondly, we have learned that our security is indivisible. We cannot escape the connections linking issues; between, for example, economic growth, environmental safety and population flows. Deterioration in any one area can destabilize the whole. We must think about security more broadly, in terms which address fundamental sources of insecurity: questions of economic development and prosperity; environmental integrity; freedom from crime and physical threat; health; membership in communities which reflect our values, traditions and aspirations.

Thirdly, we have learned that genuine security is not about control and repression. It is about striking the right balance of interests, within countries and across borders.

Fourthly, we have learned that we have to find more cooperative ways of addressing security issues, ways which maximize the relative strengths of many existing institutions. We foresee a network of collaborative arrangements - local, regional and global - forming the building-blocks of a new system of collective security, all hinged on the focal point of the United Nations.

The Charter of the United Nations itself provides useful guidance, describing possible relationships between the United Nations and regional bodies in the pacific settlement of local disputes. Cooperation between the United Nations, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Community in Europe; between the United Nations, the Commonwealth and the Organization of African Unity in Africa; and between the United Nations and the Organization of American States in Central America and Haiti has moved us considerably along the path anticipated by the drafters of the Charter. Moreover, regional organizations are often the best equipped to deal with local sources of instability and potential conflict, such as water disputes, demographic shifts or human rights concerns.

For decades, the cold war hemmed us in. That time is over. We have it within our grasp to fulfil the promise of our Charter, to build a global cooperative security system centred on the United Nations. For it is the United Nations alone which can provide a universal forum for elaborating new principles and negotiating new rules and standards. And it is the United Nations alone which, as a universal body, can bring the full weight of the international community to bear on specific critical issues.

In the last five years alone, the involvement of the United Nations in various multilateral military efforts has grown exponentially. Five years ago there were seven such operations; today there are 16. Five years ago there were 9,000 military personnel deployed with the United Nations; today there are nearly 80,000, more than Canada has in all of its regular armed forces. And as we look around the world today, the prospect of even more operations has to be seen as inevitable.

The transformation in United Nations operations has not been simply quantitative of late. The fact is that the United Nations is now engaged in a range of activities which goes well beyond the traditional concepts of peace-keeping we have been accustomed to in the past. Much of the Secretary-General's ground-breaking "An Agenda for Peace" has moved from prescription to reality, and rightly so. It is quite right to ask whether and under what conditions the United Nations should commit its resources to the resolution of international crises. It is equally right to ask whether the United Nations has the right tools to do what is asked of it.

(*spoke in French*)

The rapid expansion of United Nations operations in the past several years has been both unprecedented and instructive. In the process we have all learned certain lessons, some in a very wrenching fashion. We would all do well to take stock of our recent experience and determine how we can together improve our capacity to act more effectively.

Having been an active participant in virtually every United Nations military operation, Canada has made its own diagnosis and come to its own conclusions as to some remedies that should be pursued.

(*spoke in English*)

To begin with, we must improve our collective capacity to judge, to determine accurately and dispassionately the nature of impending threats and the facts of specific cases. We must also improve our capacity to act, to respond firmly and effectively to events before they deteriorate into crises.

There are steps we can take now to improve our collective capacity in the field of preventive diplomacy. Recent initiatives to strengthen our early-warning system should be implemented. To do that, the Secretary-General should be given the resources necessary for independent political analysis, analysis that he could draw on before armed conflict is unleashed and when non-military intervention can still be effective. Not only must warnings be timely; they must also have an impact on decisions. The Secretary-General must make full use of the provisions of Article 99 of the Charter to bring to the attention of the Security Council situations which may threaten peace. This would itself provide a powerful stimulus to global attention and necessary preventive action.

The United Nations ability to conduct preventive diplomacy through the good offices of the Secretary-General must be strengthened. The Secretary-General's efforts to address dozens of conflicts and potential conflicts require tangible support. The preventive deployment of peace-keepers to forestall conflict, as we have recently done in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, can prove very useful and in the long run avoid a much larger commitment of scarce resources.

Experience with the assignment of United Nations military forces around the world has, in our view, demonstrated a number of shortcomings. It is incumbent on us all to move quickly to respond to them by changing the way that business is conducted. First, major operations can no longer be run on an ad hoc basis. The management, planning and operational capacity of the United Nations has to be reinforced. A permanent strategic headquarters staff capable of controlling two or more large-scale, multidimensional operations has to be put in place. To be effective, this headquarters would need a comprehensive information processing and planning capacity.

Secondly, the United Nations ability to bring *matériel* and personnel speedily to a theatre of operations and to ensure coordination between sources of equipment and personnel has to be strengthened. Too often in the past, the Secretary-General has had to delay United Nations-sanctioned operations for want of adequate personnel or *matériel*.

The ability to deploy United Nations troops rapidly to emerging flashpoints has to be upgraded substantially. At a minimum, Member States should enter into formal commitments with the Secretary-General to provide troops on a stand-by basis and tied to readiness standards, as Canada has done in the past year.

Thirdly, United Nations Members have to build and develop the large cadre of peace-keepers necessary for the United Nations missions of the future. Peace-keeping demands cultural sensitivity, the ability to mediate and a host of other skills. Training will be required, particularly of a corps of senior officers who will have to exercise leadership in complex, difficult and dangerous situations. Training holds the key to successfully integrating different national contingents into one operation.

Fourthly, we need to ensure that field operations meet high performance standards. Work on the development of a common code of conduct and operating procedures for all personnel serving under the United Nations flag should be brought to an early conclusion.

Fifthly, we must also come to grips with the increasingly serious dangers facing our peace-keepers. We and others are working to clarify and codify principles and measures for the protection of United Nations personnel, particularly those involved in peace-keeping operations. Canada will be proposing specific provisions for such a convention to be discussed during the coming General Assembly session.

In the last several years, a range of innovative proposals has been put forward with a view to enhancing the capacity of the United Nations to mount effective multilateral military operations. Many of these suggestions have been the subject of extensive debate in Canada, as they have in many other countries. We have, in fact, been proponents of some of these suggestions. We fully recognize, of course, that ours is but one perspective. Actually realizing these necessitates a much broader level of support by United Nations Member States.

Accordingly, in the best interests of future United Nations efforts, it is time that a panel of civilian and military experts with experience in United Nations operations be charged with assessing these and other proposals which could further enhance the operational capacity of the United Nations. Such a report should be

finalized and submitted to the Secretary-General next summer. It should include clear recommendations on both the merits of the proposals and, as importantly, how they could be implemented and financed. The report would in turn would provide us with the basis for coming to collective decisions on whether or not to proceed with any of these. Only in this way can we more definitively determine not only the potential need but the requisite support for these proposals.

The agenda for such a review would include: the establishment of a permanent United Nations staff college for the training of military officers; the creation of more training facilities for United Nations troops; the development of a network of United Nations material supply depots stockpiled with equipment for rapid dispatch to new United Nations operations; the question whether United Nations Member States would provide at nominal, if any, cost equipment and *matériel* which would be made available to United Nations contingents not having such resources in their own military establishments; and the creation of a permanent rapid deployment force under United Nations command, based possibly on a new United Nations volunteer force.

There may well be other issues that should be on that agenda. The key, however, is to have that assessment made. My own Government is committed to reviewing these and other related questions in the context of a reappraisal of our own military capacity, including our participation in United Nations operations.

Security is more than simply a matter of being able to deploy adequate numbers of troops on a timely basis. Modern United Nations missions are drawing on expertise far beyond that of traditional military peace-keepers. There is a demand for civilian police, for election workers, for human rights monitors, for engineers, administrators and other specialists to rebuild infrastructure. It is not enough to stop hostilities; the United Nations is now expected to build the peace as well.

We are moving from a tradition of interposing peace-keepers between hostile forces to new forms of engagement. Rebuilding societies to stand on their own will be a complex and lengthy process. Diplomatic peacemaking, military and civilian peace-keeping and peace-building pose new sorts of challenges. It has become obvious, in our view, that a more integrated and coordinated approach by the United Nations is now mandatory if we are to cope successfully with many of the crises which draw United Nations military forces. We have had a measure of success in this regard in Cambodia, but far less in other situations, such as Somalia. United Nations military operations cannot in and of themselves address or resolve the root causes of conflict. That is something that can be achieved only through a much more broadly based effort, be it political, economic or social. In effect, we need a capacity to rebuild, over time, countries or societies which have suffered structural collapse.

An effective system of cooperative security, led by a reinvigorated United Nations, will cost money; but then, genuine security always carries a price which is worth paying. Resources are limited, and we must all share the burden. This means paying United Nations bills in full and on time. That is what Canada does, and we expect others to do the same. It is difficult to overstate the damage that non-payment and the build-up of arrears does to the United Nations system, and to our collective capacity for effective action.

Burden-sharing means taking part in the activities of the United Nations, from contributing troops for peace-keeping missions to providing observers for election monitoring. Today, Canada is providing just under 4 per cent of all United Nations forces. Little less than one year ago, Canadian troops accounted for 10 per cent of all United Nations forces. Those are rather remarkable figures when we consider that Canada accounts for less than one half of 1 per cent of the world's population, and that our military establishment represents less than 1 per cent of global military expenditures. This is not to suggest that we are seeking a diminished role, one more commensurate with our relative status in the world. It is, instead, to question whether others are doing their fair share.

Burden-sharing also means sharing political responsibility for shaping and taking decisions, and for ensuring that decisions and commitments are fulfilled. That is why we welcome the Security Council's increasing attention to drafting clear mandates, sharply defining objectives and setting deadlines. Clear and realistic mandates are necessary if the United Nations is to remain both credible and effective.

In Canada as in a number of other countries, governments are facing difficult fiscal circumstances and publics that are demanding more effective, efficient and economical service from government. The need for rationalization of government, for streamlining, and for an end to overlap, duplication and waste is one that my own Government has addressed in the last several months. Our

efforts in that respect will continue. We have a responsibility to our own taxpayers to ensure that the same standards and objectives are applied to the international institutions of which we are members.

Institutions of the United Nations cannot remain immune to the challenges, financial as well as political, of the late twentieth century. They too must help shoulder the burden by becoming leaner, more efficient, better focused, more responsible and more responsive. They must adapt, just as Member States are doing, to new technologies, to continuing fiscal restraint, to the challenge to do better with less. The structures here are not sacrosanct. No position, expenditure or institution should be free of the scrutiny under which we in Canada, and others elsewhere, have placed our own State structures.

We applaud the reforms initiated by the Secretary-General and we pledge our support for further action. We urge him to press on, and we urge all Member States to support his efforts. Our security, the security of generations to come, is in the balance.

We have a great deal to do. All of our efforts to reform the peacemaking and peace-keeping function of the United Nations will be in vain if we are not able to come to terms collectively with what must be regarded as the most dangerous current threat to international security: the ubiquitous spread of weapons of mass destruction. In too many areas of the world, the prospect of conflict involving nuclear weapons risks destabilizing already tense situations, and could lead to human disasters of unimaginable proportions. We must muster the collective resolve to put teeth into the Non-Proliferation Treaty, disciplining harshly those who violate its provisions and giving confidence to those who abide by its undertakings. We wholeheartedly welcome the priority attached to this issue by President Clinton, and the practical measures he proposed.

Our own priorities are clear: further progress in nuclear arms reduction; indefinite extension and universal adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty; negotiation of a comprehensive test-ban treaty; early progress to bring the chemical weapons Convention into force; and strengthening of the United Nations Conventional Arms Register. These direct investments in peace and security must be accompanied by collective action on the root causes of insecurity.

We must develop and consolidate democratic institutions and the rule of law. Modern history teaches us that democracies are the least likely States to wage war, the best guarantors of peace. The impartial rule of law domestically is the surest way of keeping democracies democratic; internationally, it is the best way to resolve disputes before they become crises.

We must protect and promote human rights. Security begins at the level of the individual, and there can be neither peace nor security while people, singly or collectively, minorities or majorities, are unable to uphold their dignity and exercise their inherent rights. The General Assembly must build on the progress achieved at the Vienna Conference earlier this year and agree to establish by the end of this year the post of United Nations high commissioner for Human Rights.

We must attack the poverty, deprivation and economic underdevelopment which so often lie at the heart of instability and insecurity. The Secretary-General should draw up an agenda for development. It should incorporate a bold rethinking of how the United Nations can best play its important role in the economic and social spheres, while avoiding the duplication of activities best carried forward elsewhere. The Agenda could help redefine the role of the United Nations in promoting sustainable development in close cooperation with other international economic and financial institutions. We owe no less to the children of the world as we celebrate the third anniversary of the Summit for Children.

(spoke in French)

To be lasting, economic growth has to respect the environment. Hence, we have to follow through on our collective commitments at last year's Rio Summit to protect the environment. The social and economic costs of not doing so are simply unacceptable, a fact that is all too real for the thousands of Canadians dependent on the Atlantic fishery.

(spoke in English)

The brutal collapse of the fishery in the North-West Atlantic and elsewhere is compelling evidence of the need to address that crisis urgently. The United Nations must urgently adopt a legally binding international regime to conserve and manage high-seas fish stocks.

It is clear, however, that no amount of development assistance can match the economic growth that could be achieved through a freer flow of goods, services, capital and ideas among our Member States. Indeed, the single most important step we can take collectively towards

improving the prosperity of developing and developed economies alike would be to reach, without any further delay, a substantial outcome to the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations. These discussions have reached a pivotal stage; we must not lose this precious opportunity. My Government remains committed to doing its part to reach that goal and to pursuing other opportunities for trade liberalization, such as through the North American Free Trade Agreement. We are convinced that the Agreement will make the North American economies both more competitive and more open and will provide a much needed stimulus to global trade and investment.

Our peace and security are not there for the taking. We must work for them, and work hard - in our own countries, in our regions, and globally. We must renew and revitalize existing structures and, where necessary, build anew. We have a historic opportunity to make good on the language of the United Nations Charter, on the thwarted promise of those early days, to build in our own time a cooperative system of peace and security which respects difference but holds fast to universal principles of human dignity and freedom. Let us move forward, together, now.

The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the Prime Minister of Canada for the statement she has just made.

Mrs. Kim Campbell, Prime Minister of Canada, was escorted from the rostrum.

ADDRESS BY MR. JANEZ DRNOVSEK, PRIME MINISTER OF THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now hear an address by the Prime Minister of the Republic of Slovenia.

Mr. Janez Drnovsek, Prime Minister of the Republic of Slovenia, was escorted to the rostrum.

The PRESIDENT: I have great pleasure in welcoming the Prime Minister of the Republic of Slovenia, His Excellency Mr. Janez Drnovsek, and inviting him to address the Assembly.

Mr. DRNOVSEK (Slovenia): Allow me, Sir, to offer you, and the Republic of Guyana, sincere congratulations on your election as President of the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session. This session is taking place at a moment of world history which everyone agrees to be exceptional, so it is particularly important that it be as successful as possible. The fact that you are guiding its work encourages me to hope that it will be so.

Let me also take this opportunity to express my gratitude for the contribution of the former Foreign Minister of the Republic of Bulgaria, His Excellency Mr. Stoyan Ganev, as President of the Assembly at its forty-seventh session.

The very presence of Slovenia as an independent State and a Member of the United Nations is adequate testimony to the fact that the world has fundamentally changed. Together with a series of other countries that are either newly founded or have disengaged themselves from the shackles of limited sovereignty - or both simultaneously - Slovenia was not, of course, only an object of those changes, but a protagonist in them. The motive force for these changes was the democratic aspirations of nations, their democratic movements and prominent individuals from all spheres of social life. Many of the basic principles of the United Nations Charter, especially the principle of respect for human rights, motivated the democratic movements in their struggle for political and economic change.

We should not forget that fact today as we watch the processes under way in the part of the world formerly known as the East. The tragic events which we perceive as having resulted from those very changes should not blur the memories of the movement for the freedom and dignity of men and women as individuals and as members of historically, culturally and linguistically defined entities. The difficulties faced by the new democracies were expected. Yet they are strengthening democratic institutions and the effectiveness of democratic mechanisms. On the other hand, in another - the smaller - part of the East, there is an orgy of destructive violence caused by inconceivable hatred.

The old terminology, transferred to the notion of "countries of the former East", obstructs a real understanding of current events in the part of the world to which it refers. Ideological notions should be replaced by terminology that respects the cultural and historical characteristics of individual regions, which in recent history all known politics and ideologies have tried to obliterate.

The former socialist countries that earlier on had developed democracy movements are now experiencing

secure democratic development. On the other hand, in those countries with totalitarian regimes that were suddenly confronted with the end of the bipolar world and where democratic movements were barely incipient, the ensuing ideological vacuum led to nationalism accompanied by expansionism and grave violations of human rights and of the rights of minorities. Former Yugoslavia, a typical multi-ethnic State, a federation composed of six different territorially defined members, experienced the consequences of these distinctions within its former borders, and for that reason could not survive.

Every region has its own particular characteristics. Respecting them would to a great extent facilitate stabilization and the prospects of peaceful development on the basis of multilateral cooperation. It is not just for Europe in the wider sense that this is valid, although it is true that the processes of change are most pronounced in this region, for better or for worse. The changes I am referring to put seriously to the test most of the principles of international cooperation and most of the mechanisms created to enhance it. The right to self-determination is a case in point. This right, on the one hand, was denied to some nations while on the other hand the misuse of the same principle for carrying out aggressive expansionism and land-grabs has been tolerated.

The role of the United Nations has greatly increased since the end of the cold war, and the Organization is confronted with a number of issues that have to be tackled in a new way commensurate to the new atmosphere. Now it is more or less clear to everybody that we cannot do without new concepts and new mechanisms within this Organization to enable it to react in accordance with the requirements of the time. It is of crucial importance to strengthen human rights and democracy within countries and to reflect this equally in their interrelations.

There are great expectations that the United Nations will face these issues and will be able to adapt itself efficiently. In order to do this the General Assembly should make proposals in this regard. Let me mention some of the fields that these proposals could embrace.

International law needs a further evolution of substantive provisions and consensual mechanisms for their implementation. The principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States should be reaffirmed, though it should be sensibly qualified by adequate internationally defined standards. International cooperation and the interdependence of all States are continuously diminishing the scope of matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of States, while the scope of legitimate international action is being expanded. In this context there appears to be an opportunity for further protection of human rights, the rights of ethnic minorities and the environment. The Conference on Human Rights which took place in Vienna last June confirmed global standards of respect for and protection of human rights and recommended the establishment of a high commissioner for human rights. Slovenia intends to submit during this session proposals for enhancing the activities of the United Nations in the field of human rights, strengthening the Centre for Human Rights and the establishment of a high commissioner for human rights.

Economic cooperation is of particular importance. Cooperation in the framework of a series of existing international organizations and integrations must be seen in the context of its extension to new members. Agreements on economic cooperation between members and non-members of trading blocs are already being concluded, although sometimes too slowly. In any case, it is important that these associations should not close the door to the new democracies, since this could greatly impede the development of market economies in the new democracies at the very start. It is to be hoped that regional Economic Commissions, specialized agencies of the United Nations and international financial institutions will use their influence in order to help remove obstacles.

At the Earth Summit in Rio last year we took part in the efforts for closer international cooperation on the environment. We will render all possible support to the United Nations to achieve the aims of the Rio Conference, including sustainable development, and to simultaneously detect new problems in this field. Of course, success will elude us if there is no adequate supervision or sanctions.

European security since the end of the cold war has acquired different faces, and new countries have entered the European scene. Some military arrangements with purported defence aims have disbanded, and a number of countries are looking for new arrangements to safeguard their security. This represents an opportunity that should not be lost. Europe should be able to fill the security vacuum with democratic, forward-looking and adequate security arrangements for all, the more so since it is the first time in history that security is not bound to increased defence spending. This is encouraging. On the other hand, we are facing the danger of new outbreaks in different regions. This situation, more than anything else, requires preventive diplomacy, which should, by its very nature, be a matter of coordination for the United Nations,

whose views should be formed in the General Assembly and the Security Council. Existing security associations, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and the Western European Union (WEU) should be systematically extended, and care should be taken to see that there is coordination between them and decision-making institutions of the United Nations. The agreement between the United Nations and the CSCE signed in May this year is encouraging from this point of view. It may be useful to seriously consider creating forces for rapid action, wherever timely action firmly authorized by the Security Council could prevent a crisis.

During the last two years Slovenia has radically and unilaterally restricted its own military potential. More than half of the military facilities of the former Yugoslav army on Slovenian territory have been committed to civilian needs. However, the Republic of Slovenia remains subject to the arms embargo which the Security Council imposed on the former Yugoslavia. Unfortunately, this measure did not produce the desired effect in other parts of the former Yugoslavia; on the contrary, it has prevented the victims of aggression from effectively defending themselves. It is our view that it is high time the Security Council reconsidered this measure and adjusted it to realities.

I am sure that I am not alone in the view that all the new dilemmas that the world is facing also require reform of the structures and mechanisms of the United Nations. The General Assembly should more fully utilize its own competence in this sense for dealing with situations and take steps to settle international relations matters. The Security Council, in view of the new circumstances in the world and the nature of current problems, would appear to need some modification so as to be able to react more flexibly and effectively. It would be wise to increase its membership appropriately to make it more representative and to strengthen its responsibility to United Nations Member States through the General Assembly. Further, strengthening the professional competence of the Secretariat could be envisaged, thereby improving conditions for the effective operation of the Secretary-General. The current state of the world, in which we are simultaneously confronted with possible dangerous consequences of otherwise welcome changes and with the well-known mounting problems of developing countries, of course demands increased efficiency of existing and perhaps new mechanisms. This means that it will also be impossible to avoid the question of settling the regular financing of the United Nations.

Mr. Pursoo (Grenada), Vice-President, took the Chair.

In closing I must unfortunately also touch on a matter that has already disturbed and concerned the international community for far too long: the crisis in some parts of the former Yugoslavia. Slovenia, despite being near the regions of armed conflict in Croatia and in Bosnia and Herzegovina, has not been directly involved in the problems that have been the cause of armed conflict for the last two years. This does not, of course, mean that people of Slovenia and the Slovene Government are indifferent. The Republic of Slovenia is respecting sanctions and is cooperating in all efforts by the international community to bring peace to these countries. We have submitted proposals in order to alleviate the crisis, find a political solution and cut short the war and suffering. Unfortunately, the war still rages on. We are constantly reminded of this by the presence of 70,000 refugees living in Slovenia. Caring for them is no small burden for the 2 million inhabitants of Slovenia, even though we have the cooperation of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. However, international aid for refugees is decreasing.

In our view, it is crucial to abide by all the principles on which the international order after the end of cold war should be based. This would encourage the newly founded Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to follow these principles and, like other States founded on the territory of the former Yugoslavia, to seek membership in the United Nations in accordance with the Charter. The political and economic interests of all members of the former Yugoslavia can begin to be met only through negotiations, on an equal legal footing, on the succession of the former Yugoslavia.

Slovenia supports, and will continue to support, all initiatives to create a better world that provides adequate prospects for the coming generations - a world based on the mutual interests of the entire international community, without the horrors of war, poverty and social distress, a world in which human rights and the dignity of every individual are standards respected by all Governments.

I wish the General Assembly every success at the current session in its work towards this goal.

The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the Prime Minister of the Republic of Slovenia for the statement he has just made.

Mr. Janez Drnovsek, Prime Minister of the Republic of Slovenia, was escorted from the rostrum.

Mr. SATTAR (Pakistan): It is with great pleasure that I extend to the President of the General Assembly the felicitations of the Pakistan delegation on his election to preside over the forty-eighth session. His diplomatic skills and wide experience, particularly in the United Nations, will be a valuable asset for the success of this important session of the Assembly.

We express our appreciation and gratitude also to the previous President, Mr. Stoyan Ganev, for his memorable contribution in guiding the forty-seventh session of the Assembly.

A special tribute is due to the Secretary-General of our organization, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, for his dedication and dynamism. We agree with the Secretary-General that peace, development and democracy are interlinked and that

> "Cooperative global integration is now an inescapable fact and requirement for all the world's peoples." *(A/48/1, para. 13)*

Pakistan is happy to welcome the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Eritrea, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the Principality of Monaco and the Principality of Andorra as Members of our Organization. We look forward to close cooperation with them in efforts to accomplish the aims of the United Nations.

To that objective, and to the noble vision of the Charter, Pakistan has been committed ever since its independence. We have throughout sought to abide by its principles, and we reaffirm our faith in their timeless validity. As in the past, so also in the future Pakistan will extend its wholehearted cooperation to all other States in common efforts aimed at realizing the ideals that inspired the establishment of the United Nations.

Nearly half a century later retrospection evokes mixed feelings. The Organization's failures and acts of omission haunt and depress; yet Members of the United Nations have much to celebrate. Some of the achievements during these decades have been monumental.

Over 130 nations have emerged from the dark era of colonialism and alien domination, each bringing its unique genius to enrich world civilization, and to advance the cause of human dignity.

The nightmare of a nuclear Armageddon has been averted. Weapons of mass destruction are being reduced. Ideological rivalry and confrontation have yielded to peace and cooperation.

Democracy continues to triumph. People in large parts of the world have achieved economic and social progress, and better standards of living in peace and freedom.

In moments of optimism, we even perceive the glimmer of a new dawn, of a more equitable and tranquil era, when power will have been civilized, when differences and disputes between States will be resolved, not through aggression or intimidation, but by peaceful means on the basis of law and justice, as they are between individuals.

That vision appears tantalizingly close, yet it eludes our grasp. The world community's progress towards peace and prosperity is both slow and meandering. We have witnessed many setbacks and reverses. At such times the vision of peace seems to recede to the far horizon.

Respect for fundamental rights has been severely undermined. Some States have exhibited blatant disregard and contempt for international norms, allowing and even encouraging their forces to perpetrate barbarous acts that outrage the conscience of decent people.

Instead of civility and the practice of tolerance being promoted, chauvinism and the evils of bigotry and hatred are encouraged in some countries. The consequence has been pogroms against minorities and destruction and desecration of their places of worship.

The number of people in the world who have been forced to flee their homes as refugees has risen to a record level, straining the resources available for their relief.

The problem of poverty has intensified. A billion people live in penury, without adequate food and shelter. For them, life is short and brutish.

Manifestly, the United Nations has a long road to travel, and many old and new obstacles to overcome, before it fulfills the aims and purposes set for it in the Charter. But even as we count the multifarious challenges, we can draw some solace from recent successes.

A remarkable transition has taken place in Cambodia, a transition in which the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC) played a pivotal role. The commendable contribution of the Secretary General's Special Representative, Mr. Yasushi Akashi, and his collaborators, is a source of satisfaction for the Organization and its members. Committed to the promotion of peace and stability, Pakistan is happy to have provided 1,500 personnel for UNTAC during the transition.

The Declaration of Principles signed by the Palestine Liberation Organization and Israel is a positive development. Implemented in good faith, it could go down in history as an important first step towards peace and coexistence in the Middle East. Vital to the realization of that aim will be respect for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and an equitable settlement of the outstanding issues. The status of Al-Quds-el-Sharif remains a crucial issue of interest to us in Pakistan and, indeed, to Muslims all over the world.

We hope that the Declaration, evolved with the commendable contribution of Norway, and the agenda agreed between Jordan and Israel will give a fillip to the negotiations for a comprehensive peace in the Middle East, for which Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) provide an agreed and necessary basis.

In Afghanistan the accommodation achieved by the mujahidin leaders, and the formation of a coalition government, is reason for satisfaction. Consolidation of peace will allow the Afghan people to enjoy the fruits of their epic victory. Meanwhile, a programme for the reconstruction of this war-ravaged country needs to be launched immediately. By providing employment, it will reinforce the peace process. Pakistan is prepared to join in international efforts for the reconstruction of Afghanistan. Assistance is needed also for the million and a half Afghan refugees in Pakistan who are still unable to return to their homeland, pending the creation of conducive economic and political conditions.

The political evolution in South Africa holds the welcome promise of peace and freedom for all its people. They and the world at large applaud the valiant freedom fighter and statesman, Nelson Mandela, for his sagacious leadership. Pakistan will respond positively to his proposals to bring South Africa back into the comity of nations. The formation of a pluralist, democratic Government is in sight. Pakistan looks forward to developing close and friendly relations with the new South Africa.

In Somalia, too, notable progress has been made towards the restoration of law and order and the rehabilitation of its polity, though, regrettably, the process has been slow and painful. We in Pakistan are deeply grieved because our troops have suffered heavy casualties on account of the misguided acts of a Somali faction. Yet Pakistan will not abandon the United Nations Mission. Our contingent will continue to hold high the United Nations flag, assist relief operations and promote the re-establishment of peace and harmony in Somalia, for whose people we cherish abiding goodwill and fraternal affection.

We welcome the progress achieved in Mozambique, Liberia and Rwanda, and hope that the relevant agreements will be implemented in letter and in spirit. The unfortunate developments in Angola must be reversed. We urge the parties concerned to seek dialogue and national reconciliation. The international community must assist these countries in restoring peace and normalcy.

The optimism generated by the end of the cold war has been blighted by the colossal tragedy in Bosnia and Herzegovina. A member of the United Nations has been carved up by the use of force and its people brutalized through aggression and cold-blooded genocide. Crimes against humanity have been perpetrated on a scale not seen since the Holocaust. The conscience of mankind has been outraged. Yet the community of States failed to act in defence of a small State. It has succeeded, instead, in denying the inherent right of a State to self-defence. Indeed, some of the members of the Security Council even obstructed moves to assist the victims of aggression and slaughter, knowing full well that the perpetrators of aggression were being aided and abetted by their ethnic neighbours.

With their hands tied behind their backs, the Bosnians have been forced to negotiate a so-called agreement. They have been obliged to submit to a diktat in disregard of equity and even the resolutions of the Security Council. A plan that would reward aggression and legalize acquisition of territory by force cannot, and should not, win the approbation of the world community.

The General Assembly can still act, even at this eleventh hour, to salvage the hope that has been invested by the people of the world in the United Nations. Its voice must rise in defence of law and justice, in order to preserve the sovereignty of Bosnia and Herzegovina; to ensure an equitable apportionment of territory among its different ethnic components; to strengthen the United Nations force

so that it can keep and enforce the peace; to protect the safe areas to provide relief against hunger and the rigour of the approaching winter; and to punish those responsible for the bestial crimes committed in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Azerbaijan is yet another victim of aggression. Armenians have occupied Azeri territory and expelled hundreds of thousands of people from their homes. We call for an end to this aggression and for the withdrawal of Armenian forces. Also, the Azeri refugees need the assistance of the world community for the relief of their suffering.

The crisis in Kashmir calls for urgent action by the United Nations. India has unleashed a brutal reign of terror and repression in the occupied State in an unconscionable attempt to bludgeon the Kashmiri people into submission and to thwart their legitimate struggle for the realization of their right to decide their own future. This is, of course, an inherent right, but in the case of Kashmir it has been specifically pledged to them by Pakistan, by India and by the United Nations. It is sanctified in the resolutions of the Security Council pertaining to Kashmir.

Internationally respected non-governmental human rights organizations have graphically documented the brutal crimes committed by the Indian occupation forces.

Since 1990 Amnesty International has been reporting on the massive violations of human rights in Kashmir by Indian forces, on the practice of arbitrary imprisonment, torture and killings of Kashmiris in custody, and on the perpetration of rape as a matter of policy.

> "Rape is not uncommon and there is evidence of its employment as an instrument of terror", says P. M. Vandarajan, a University of Oxford lecturer, who visited Kashmir in September 1992. In his report, published by the International Federation of Human Rights, Paris, the author recalls:
>
> "The infamous mass rape by the Indian Army at Kunan Poshpora was reported widely in the press, both in India and abroad. It is, to date, the most sickening example by far of the brutal excesses of the Security Forces against the women of the region".

It is the most sickening, but it is by no means a solitary incident.

Also catalogued in the report are cases of "disappearances" of people, and of young men who "are tortured in Kashmir every day", and of extra-judicial, or illegal, executions, which "are alarmingly frequent".

The very titles of the reports issued by international human rights organizations and by reputable journals depict the grave conditions in Kashmir. Headlines and titles of reports issued during 1993 include: "Heaven on Fire", a report by Tim Gopsill on behalf of the British Parliamentary Group; "India's Shame", a London Sunday newspaper, 17 January 1993; "The crackdown in Kashmir - Torture of Detainees and Assaults on the Medical Community", Asia Watch and Physicians for Human Rights; "Extra-Judicial Executions, Rape, Arbitrary Arrests, Disappearances and other violations of Basic Human Rights by the Indian Security Forces in Indian-administered Kashmir", a report by the International Federation of Lawyers for Human Rights; "Violations of human rights committed by the Indian security forces in Jammu and Kashmir", by the same Organization; "Rape in Kashmir: A Crime of War", by Asia Watch and Physicians for Human Rights.

The report by Asia Watch, a division of Human Rights Watch, New York and Washington, and Physicians for Human Rights, Boston, released in June 1993, concludes:

> "In their efforts to crush the militant separatist movement in Kashmir, Indian government forces have systematically violated international human rights and humanitarian law. Among the worst of these violations have been the summary executions of hundreds of detainees in the custody of the security forces in Kashmir. Such killings are carried out as a matter of policy ...
>
> "Methods of torture include severe beatings, electric shock, suspension by the feet or hands, stretching the legs apart, burning with heated objects, sexual molestation and psychological deprivation and humiliation. One common form of torture involves crushing the leg muscles with a heavy wooden roller ...

Tens of thousands of Kashmiris have been killed by Indian forces in the nearly four years since India began the brutal repression in January 1990. Many more have been maimed and incapacitated.

No statistics can illustrate the agony of a people or portray their anguish and pain. But they do illustrate the iron resolve of the people to recover their birthright. Now, in the fourth year, the Kashmiri struggle continues to gather internal strength. It has been established beyond doubt that the Kashmiri people have not acquiesced and will not acquiesce in Indian occupation. They have not accepted and will not accept Indian rule.

India's position on the Kashmir question, and its policy in the occupied territory, constitute a fundamental defiance of international law and morality. India claims that Jammu and Kashmir is part of India; this claim is legally and historically baseless. The future of the State remains to be determined. The resolutions of the Security Council on this question, providing for a plebiscite to decide the accession of the State to India or Pakistan, have yet to be implemented. A member of the United Nations cannot be allowed to refuse to implement a resolution of the Security Council. The resolutions in question were, moreover, accepted by Pakistan as well as India. Law does not permit a party to unilaterally renounce an international agreement.

The struggle of the Kashmiri people to recover their freedom of choice is a righteous struggle for a fundamental right. It merits the support of all members of the United Nations. For Pakistan, a party to the dispute, such support is a matter of duty as well as right. The Government and people of Pakistan remain steadfast in their adherence to the Security Council resolutions and in our strong support for the Kashmiri right to self-determination. Pakistan calls upon India to fulfil its obligations under law. We request all other members of the United Nations to take appropriate action to halt the Indian violations of human rights in Kashmir and to ensure the implementation of the Security Council resolutions.

Recent reports testify to an alarming escalation in human rights abuses by the Indian forces in Kashmir. In order to investigate this human rights emergency, we addressed a letter to the President of the Security Council last week and reiterated our suggestion that a fact-finding mission be dispatched to Jammu and Kashmir. If India has nothing to conceal, it should accept our suggestion.

Along with the resolution of conflicts, disarmament offers a real option for States, large and small, to enhance their security and expand the frontiers of regional and global peace. The end of the cold war has removed the threat of nuclear Armageddon. We welcome the agreements on the reduction of strategic arms. Even so, thousands of nuclear weapons will remain in the arsenals of the nuclear-weapon States. We hope they will act to further reduce and eventually eliminate all nuclear weapons. The Geneva Conference on Disarmament should renew its work on a programme for nuclear disarmament to be achieved within a specific time-frame.

Until nuclear disarmament is realized, the non-nuclear-weapon States have the right to be assured by the nuclear-weapon States that there will be no use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons. The disappearance of the rival military blocs which relied on nuclear deterrence for security against each other should make it possible for the nuclear Powers to undertake not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States.

For over 20 years Pakistan has advocated the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. We are therefore happy that negotiations are to open in Geneva for the conclusion of such a treaty. Pakistan will participate actively in this endeavour. We have also consistently supported a global ban on the production of fissile material which should be realized on a non-discriminatory basis.

The regional approach has proved to be an effective avenue to promote nuclear non-proliferation. The concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones is finally being translated into reality. The Latin American nuclear-weapon-free zone came into force this year. Mutual arrangements for non-proliferation have also been worked out by Brazil and Argentina. The dramatic reversal in South Africa's nuclear weapons programme has created the conditions for establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa. In the Middle East, too, the progress towards peace may create political momentum for non-proliferation.

Unfortunately, the hopes for non-proliferation in South Asia received a serious setback when India exploded a nuclear bomb in 1974. Nevertheless, Pakistan has continued to advocate efforts to eliminate the danger of proliferation in South Asia. To that end, we have put forward several proposals. These include a South Asia nuclear-weapon-free zone; the simultaneous signature of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) by India and Pakistan; mutual verification by these countries of each other's nuclear facilities; a bilateral nuclear-test-ban treaty; a conference with the participation of India, Pakistan, the United States, Russia and China to elaborate non-proliferation and security arrangements in our region. Regrettably, these proposals have not yet been accepted.

Conventional disarmament can also be promoted most effectively in the regional context. The Geneva Conference on Disarmament should elaborate principles to promote such regional arms control and disarmament in the conventional field. The United Nations arms transfer Register has proved to be a successful experiment. Pakistan has provided the required information on its arms acquisition and sales. However, this Register may not provide a complete picture of the dangers to peace in various regions. It is only when both the transfer and the indigenous production of armaments are taken into account that a comprehensive evaluation of arms balances or imbalances can be made.

To promote peace and prosperity, it is essential to facilitate rather than restrain the application of modern technology for economic and social development. The United Nations should consider preparing a comprehensive study of the impediments placed arbitrarily in the way of the application of advanced technology for the promotion of economic and social development in the developing countries.

The global recession of the past few years has brought severe hardship to many of the poorest countries and especially to the poorest within these countries. The growing number of people living in absolute poverty threatens political stability in many developing countries. A comprehensive programme for development should be accorded high priority by the world community.

The forces of protectionism must be resisted. The Uruguay Round must be concluded by the end of 1993. Adequate official resources should be channelled to those developing countries which are implementing far-reaching economic reform and liberalization measures. The desperate needs of Africa require urgent attention. A new flow of official assistance should be directed in particular to the eradication of poverty, to human and social development programmes and to sustainable growth in the developing countries.

The developing countries need urgently to address the inexorable and unsustainable growth in their populations. We greatly appreciate the dedication and efforts of Mr. Nafis Sadik, the indefatigable head of the United Nations Population Fund. We hope the forthcoming population Conference in Cairo will devise a comprehensive long-term strategy to meet the challenge of burgeoning populations. At the same time, the needs of the world's children must assume priority on national and international agendas.

With the collapse of the Iron Curtain, there are now no political or ideological obstacles in the way of creating a truly global economy based on the principles of the market. We hope that regional economic groupings will produce a momentum towards global economic interaction and integration, and not the reverse. Pakistan stands at the crossroads of South Asia, Central Asia, West Asia and the Gulf, and can serve as a link for mutually beneficial economic, commercial and industrial cooperation between these adjacent regions.

The United Nations is the only forum where the nations of the world can concert their policies to construct the new structures for global peace and progress. The Secretary General has pointed in the right direction in his report entitled "An Agenda for Peace".

It is essential to strengthen the mechanisms for dispute-settlement and the resolution of conflicts provided for in the Charter of the United Nations. At the same time, the Security Council must exhibit a more uniform and consistent resolve to implement its own decisions and resolutions. Only thus can the goal of collective security become a living reality.

Pakistan agrees that an appropriate enlargement of the membership of the Security Council is required to enhance its representative character. Its procedures should also be made more transparent. The guiding principles for reform must be democracy and the sovereign equality of Member States. We cannot contemplate according privileged status to those countries which have a record of defying the principles of the United Nations Charter and refusing to implement the resolutions of the Security Council.

The demands made on the United Nations for peace-keeping and peacemaking have increased significantly. Today there are 80,000 United Nations peace-keepers engaged in some 17 operations. Their missions are often difficult and dangerous. Yet the Members of the United Nations have to accept the risks and assist States and communities threatened by more powerful neighbours and adversaries. Pakistan is among the largest contributors to United Nations peace-keeping operations, with more than 6,000 personnel committed to United Nations operations at present.

If the United Nations is to discharge its growing responsibilities, it must be assured of stable and adequate resources to finance its activities. The cost of alternatives would be immensely higher.

The forty-eighth session of the General Assembly should mark a watershed - a transition from the habits of the cold war to an endeavour to construct peace and universal prosperity in a new multipolar era. To succeed in this endeavour, we shall need to arrest the dangerous proliferation of national and ethnic conflicts and disputes; establish the supremacy of human rights, democracy and freedom; prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and move towards nuclear and conventional disarmament, and arrest the forces of trade protectionism and mercantilism to foster global and sustainable development.

The challenges that the Member States of the United Nations confront are imposing indeed. Yet, the opportunities for genuine peace and universal prosperity are also most promising. With goodwill and cooperation, Member States can make significant progress at this session towards the vision of peace, progress and human solidarity envisaged in the Charter.

Mr. SOLANA (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The United Nations has embarked on an irreversible process of profound transformation. Efficiency and flexibility will be the defining features of this process. But an effective United Nations must continue to be in the service of peace and development.

The United Nations of the next century must not be a mechanism, however efficient, for balancing the interests of the most powerful. The Organization must move ahead as the world's primary instrument for promoting development and solidarity among nations and among men.

Our Organization is first and foremost a body of sovereign nations. It does not and cannot have any other will than that expressed here by Member States. The drastic increase in the number of Members over the last four years, something that had not been seen since the days of decolonization, underscores this characteristic and is also proof of the confidence that we States place in the United Nations.

This community of nations now wishes to internationalize certain issues which in earlier times fell exclusively within the internal jurisdiction of States. Mexico, as a country aware of its international responsibilities, is acting within the requirements of the new consensuses. But we must repeat time and again that we reject the idea of international action developing to the detriment of national sovereignty.

All the peoples represented here must participate in forging the Organization of the future. Mexico sees in any reforms a historic opportunity to strengthen the democratic life of this Organization.

The question of equitable representation in the Security Council plays a central role in the reform of our Organization. There is a consensus on the need to increase the number of seats in the Council. Whereas in 1945 there were 51 Members of the United Nations, today there are 184 of us. For this reason, we should perhaps try, at the very least, to double the number of seats in the Council. But simply increasing the membership would not be enough.

The restructuring of the Council must take into account, first of all, the fact that the Council lacks authority of its own. It acts by the mandate of those of us who have decided, as sovereign States, to delegate our authority to it for the delicate task of maintaining world peace. The question of the Council's composition must be addressed having regard to the overriding need to guarantee the legitimacy and transparency of the Council's actions.

Those who make the greatest contributions to the maintenance of peace, not necessarily those who are the largest producers and exporters of the world's weapons, should be members of the Council. Carrying out peace-keeping operations is not simply a question of placing military contingents at the Council's disposition. We must recognize the efforts of all those countries which have brought about the peaceful settlement of international disputes. The recent frequent recourse to the Security Council has tended to hide the fact that our first obligation is to resolve differences by peaceful means.

A representative body must be democratic. The right of veto is not democratic, and therefore Mexico has never supported it. Together, we must seek new ways to control the exercise of that right and ensure that no permanent member alone can decide or obstruct the Council's action.

Transparency in the working methods of the Council will restore to the General Assembly the primacy derived from its universality and pluralism. We propose that a General Assembly working group be established to make recommendations on all aspects of the Security Council's reform.

In recent years peace-keeping operations have increased considerably. This shows that the world has not yet managed to resolve its most pressing problems.

Nationalisms persist. Xenophobia and racism are on the rise. Extreme poverty has increased.

Mexico sees peace-keeping operations as an excellent instrument for containing the effects of conflict situations. Such operations exist to create the conditions for a political solution to be reached by peaceful means. They are an opportunity for peace, but they are not peace itself.

Before the Security Council decides to set up a peace-keeping operation, all parties to the conflict must have given their consent. Only in this way can we guarantee the inviolability of the sovereign rights of States and respect for their internal jurisdiction.

A clear mandate is also indispensable. Precisely because their functions have become diversified, the Blue Helmets must have clearly delimited fields of activity. My Government is concerned that the scope of activity of the members of those forces can be widened *in situ*, and that their areas of competence are confused with other collective actions based on the enforcement measures outlined in Chapter VII of the Charter.

In Somalia United Nations forces should only ensure that the international humanitarian aid reaches its intended beneficiaries. The international community's support for peace-keeping operations and humanitarian relief depends on their impartiality and transparency.

Mexico makes an urgent appeal to Member States immediately to lay down parameters regulating all aspects of the establishment and functioning of peace-keeping operations.

No force can replace political will in finding solutions to international conflicts. This is demonstrated by the agreement between the Palestinian Liberation Organization and the State of Israel regarding autonomy for the occupied territories. Mexico congratulates both the parties involved, as well as those who assisted them in this great success of political intelligence, of concertation and respect for the rights of the other side. Weapons are yielding to the rule of reason. The self-determination of peoples and the right of every State to live within secure and recognized boundaries - principles to which Mexico has always subscribed - are beginning to gain strength in the Middle East.

In contrast to the signs of hope we are seeing in the Middle East, the failure of the efforts to bring peace to the former Yugoslavia is clear. Peace plans come and go, but there has been no end to the killing and suffering of innocent people. Mexico urges all the parties to the conflict to agree on concrete confidence-building measures which will allow the conditions for a broad, lasting agreement to be created.

Mexico welcomes the recent decision by the United States, France, the United Kingdom and Russia unilaterally to extend the moratorium on nuclear testing. This decision will make it possible for the Conference on Disarmament finally to begin negotiations to ratify a treaty completely banning these tests. We hope that all the nuclear Powers, including China, will join the moratorium.

This historic decision, inspired and encouraged from the beginning by my country, will be a vital step in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Mexico stresses the priority of the negotiations, both on their own merits and because of the effect they will have on the next Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference, which will determine the future of this important international instrument. For Mexico, the complete cessation of nuclear tests is inextricably linked to the fate of the non-proliferation regime.

The community of nations must now confront another danger: drugs. Now the largest illegal business in history, they are putting an end to human lives, corrupting the forces of order and harming political institutions, and they can even affect the stability of States.

We cannot question the merit of the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, an instrument which has served to guide State policies and coordinate international cooperation. Certain local and national battles have been won as a result of them. But the war has not been won, and it is now a world war.

In view of the uncontrollable spread throughout the world of the dirty business of drugs, of their consumption, production and traffic, and all the related illegal activities, we must give thought to the ineffectiveness of the strategies we have followed, and we must adopt a new course. We must intensify our political determination, imagination and strategic creativity and, above all, international cooperation in which there is respect for sovereignty and no one claims preeminence, in order to stop the growth of this terrible social cancer.

Another central issue of our times is the great migratory currents which are developing with renewed vigour as the century draws to a close. The great international migrations are a result of the polarization of wealth and well-being. They are a problem which affects the entire world, exceeding the capacity for action of individual States. We need new plans for international cooperation to seek solutions to the most distressing problems relating to economic underdevelopment.

Every wave of migration throughout history has its own explanations, and the explanations are not necessarily related. However, they always include the search for a better life. Changes in the world's structure are both a brake on migration and an encouragement. In 1989, 1 per cent of the world's population - more than 50 million people - lived outside their country of origin. In 1992, only three years later, this figure had doubled. At the beginning of the 1990s, the number of refugees in the world had reached 17 million.

Those countries which, because of their economic development and social peace, seem to be able to accept new groups of migrants are today undergoing internal conflicts at times expressed through manifestations of ethnic and religious intolerance.

During this period of difficult transition towards a new ordering of power and balance in the world, internal tensions, protectionist tendencies, the global recession and the disintegration of numerous States have combined to make certain countries perceive the phenomenon of migration as a threat to their national security.

Let us keep this phenomenon from overwhelming us by adopting restrictive measures that are only superficial palliatives.

Mexico proposes that the Assembly begin serious thought on this subject as soon as possible.

The national plans of any State must be based on policies which make it possible for the inhabitants to live in a dignified manner in their own country. Only in this way can we ensure that whole peoples will not try to leave in search of better economic opportunities. Extreme poverty has increased in all areas of the world. For as long as the richest one fifth of the world's population represents 83 per cent of total income, we will have failed in our efforts at economic cooperation.

The countries of Latin America and those of Central and Eastern Europe have made special efforts to make internal adjustments to bring about economic reforms that would have been hard even to imagine a few years ago. The problem of critical poverty, however, cannot be left to the whim of market forces. In Mexico the State has not abdicated its social responsibility. Indeed, we have strengthened our development policies based on solidarity.

President Carlos Salinas de Gortari has said, time and time again, that in order to consolidate any programme of adjustment and economic stability, the promotion of social programmes is indispensable. He has also stressed that the expansion, modernization and proper orientation of educational programmes was the only way, in the long term, to increase productivity and raise the living standards of the people.

The convening of the World Summit for Social Development in 1995 shows that the United Nations has acknowledged the priority nature of this item on the international agenda. Mexico is already participating with enthusiasm in preparations for this important event.

In the course of this year the World Conference on Human Rights was held at Vienna. The agreements reached must lead to a strengthening of already existing legal instruments. The community of States participating in the Conference expressed their political determination to implement these agreements in a non-selective manner, with objectivity and respect for universality. This is a fundamental aspect of the protection and promotion of human rights throughout the world. Mexico would repeat before the Assembly that full respect for human rights requires us to direct our efforts towards the weakest groups: those that live in conditions of poverty, refugees, ethnic minorities, and all those people in need of respect for their way of life and their culture.

Mexico's total trade with the United States of America and Canada is equivalent to 20 per cent of its gross national product. For this reason it signed the North American Free Trade Agreement and parallel agreements. On that basis we hope to promote, regulate and ensure trade flows, services and investments among these three countries. In due course this will be the largest free-trade area in the world: 360 million people with a product worth $7 trillion, a moving force of principal importance for the world economy.

But Mexico is also a substantial and proud part of Latin America. We have our cultural links and historic

alliances in Latin America. We give priority to our cooperation with Central America and with the countries of the Caribbean. We participate actively in the Rio Group and in the Latin American Economic System (SELA). We, together with Colombia and Venezuela, are involved in negotiations on free trade with the Group of Three, and we hope that these will be completed this year. With Chile we already have an agreement which has been in existence since January 1992. We are also having talks with other countries in the area.

We participate actively in the Ibero-American Conference, which is gaining the kind of standing that befits an organization of 21 Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking countries in America and Europe.

As an Atlantic country we feel very close to Europe, where we have our principal partners and friends. We feel especially close to the European Community, with which we have a standing dialogue.

We are also a Pacific country and have significantly expanded the number of our representatives and our trade with Asian countries. We appreciate the support that has been given to us by the countries of the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation Council to help us to enter that body very soon.

We have also been invited by the 24 countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). We appreciate the invitation. We are working out the details of our entry into this prestigious group.

We congratulate the leaders of South Africa, President De Klerk and Nelson Mandela, on the agreements that they have reached and we are ready immediately to initiate full relations with that Republic.

We recognize and fully support the efforts that have been made in Haiti. Our Ambassador has now returned to Port au Prince. We reiterate our offer to the Secretary-General to give technical and economic resources for the general recovery of Haiti.

We wish to continue to be respectful friends of each and every one of the States that are Members of the United Nations.

The central strategy of the foreign policies of President Carlos Salinas de Gortari are diversification and the deepening of our relations with all regions and countries of the world.

Mexico has already begun preparations for the commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations. In my country this will not be an occasion for meaningless celebrations and self-congratulatory gestures. We are making a serious effort to give serious thought to the future of the Organization. The first question that we must answer, however, is: What functions do we want the United Nations to perform in the coming century? All the rest will follow by accretion.

If in truth we have an opportunity - as has so often been said since the end of the cold war - to turn the Organization into the cornerstone of a truly new, more just international order, then let us take action.

Mr. KOOIJMANS (Netherlands): First of all, please convey to His Excellency, Ambassador Insanally, my congratulations on his election to the presidency of the forty-eighth session of the United Nations General Assembly. This session of the General Assembly is being held at a point in time in which the United Nations is being asked to play a constructive role in many fields. The onerous task of helping to respond to this challenge rests on his capable shoulders. I should like to wish him every success in his task and I pledge the full support of the delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

The world is balancing between great hope and immense suffering. Walls have tumbled not only in Europe. In the Middle East two courageous leaders, Prime Minister Rabin and Chairman Arafat, have set out on the road to reconciliation between their people. In South Africa Mr. Mandela and President De Klerk showed similar courage in breaking with the past and ushering in a new democratic South Africa. At the same time, we see violence of many kinds raking the face of the Earth. From Angola to Bosnia villages are being destroyed and innocent people are slaughtered in cold blood.

The future of Russia as well is crucial to our hopes. A democratic Russia at peace with itself and its neighbours is a major element of international stability. In Russia, too, we see a courageous statesman trying to break with the past: President Boris Yeltsin. I join many others in expressing my full support for his efforts to consolidate democracy in Russia.

The end of the cold war created a historic opportunity to shape a more just and peaceful world. History will

judge us severely if we let this opportunity slip through our hands.

Strengthening international peace and security involves a broad range of efforts. It is now widely recognized that "security" cannot be viewed in military or political-military terms alone. A broader definition is called for. Indeed, last year's summit meeting of the Security Council emphasized that non-military sources of instability in the economic, social, humanitarian and ecological fields can be threats to peace and security as well. The traditional distinction between conflicts between States and conflicts within States is also becoming blurred. Bloodshed within a State tends, sooner or later, to spill across national borders. This, of course, raises the issue of sovereignty. How do we define sovereignty at a time of increasing interdependence and increasing mutual vulnerability? Sovereignty is certainly an important principle of international law. But this principle can never have been intended to shield from the outside world dictators who massacre their own people. Nor can it be intended to allow the perpetuation of large-scale suffering and death in a State that has collapsed into anarchy. At times the international community can indeed have a moral duty to intervene. And at times it can be necessary for the United Nations to take over the de facto exercise of sovereignty in such a shattered State to allow it to be rebuilt. We must hope that this will succeed in Somalia. We can take heart from current developments in Cambodia, which prove that such ambitious ventures can succeed.

A number of recent resolutions of the Security Council have broken new ground by extending international responsibility to encompass the plight of individual countries such as Somalia and Bosnia. Thus the definition of what constitutes a threat to international peace and security has gradually been widened.

In his recent speech in Quebec, Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali discussed the issue of "conflict situations within nations". He said:

> "It is these new conflicts which are most threatening to international peace today and which are most damaging to the rights of individuals".

On that occasion the Secretary-General called for "a new diplomacy for democracy and human rights". I believe that this idea is a valuable addition to our "Agenda for Peace".

Let me mention here the United Nations Conference on Human Rights, which opened up new possibilities for improving the protection of human rights. After a difficult start, the outcome of the Conference was certainly gratifying. The Final Document contains important recommendations for further steps, which should now be implemented.

Thus, the Kingdom of the Netherlands would like to underscore the urgent appeal of the Conference to the Secretary-General and the General Assembly to increase drastically the funding of the United Nations Centre for Human Rights. It is of crucial importance that in the course of this session of the General Assembly the post of high commissioner for human rights be created, and the broad outline of the mandate established. This session will also provide us with an opportunity to tackle one of the most heinous categories of human rights violations - that of grave war crimes - through the establishment of the International War Crimes Tribunal. The Kingdom of the Netherlands, with its rich tradition in the field of international law, is proud to have been asked to host the Tribunal in The Hague.

The increasing responsibilities that the United Nations is called upon to shoulder emphasize the twin requirements of legitimacy and effectiveness. This brings us to the heart of the debate on enlargement of the Security Council. Clearly, we must be careful not to jeopardize the decision-making ability of the Security Council by making it unwieldy. However, I would favor extension of the Council by the inclusion of a few major countries, provided that they were willing and able to carry the share of collective responsibility that went with their membership.

The "Agenda for Peace" invites us to take a broader view of the task of maintaining peace and security. It rightly stresses the need for early warning and early action with regard to a crisis; or - even better - preventive action. Developments in the former Yugoslavia and in other trouble spots of the world have once again confirmed that the longer a crisis is allowed to fester, the more difficult it is to bring it under control, and the higher the cost of such action.

I believe that, in this light, we should try to rethink the interrelationship of the various instruments of crisis management. Diplomatic efforts, economic sanctions and military pressure should not necessarily be viewed as sequential but, rather, as an integrated set of instruments. Peacemaking, peace-keeping and post-conflict

peace-building require the full range of United Nations instruments, including those of the humanitarian and socio-economic sectors.

The enormous increase in the number and scope of United Nations peace-keeping operations confronts us all with a daunting task. Moreover, in many cases the environment in which these operations take place has changed: whereas, previously, peace-keeping operations tended to be conducted in a benign environment, where all parties benefited from the implementation of a limited mandate, now peace-keepers often operate in a hostile climate, where one or more parties frown upon the United Nations presence and the Organization's mandate. This means that many operations these days are fraught literally with physical danger for United Nations personnel - civilian as well as military - and that privileges and immunities are often violated. No longer does the blue flag automatically command respect, and this directly affects the credibility of the United Nations. Consequently, mandates now tend to be stronger than before, and often they are explicitly based upon Chapter VII of the Charter.

The changing character of peace-keeping operations requires personnel with different qualifications. Well-trained soldiers used to be able to do the job; today we require also specialized units in the field of logistics, staff officers with experience in multinational operations, mine-clearing experts, and so on. On the civilian side, police officers, electoral experts, administrators and human-rights specialists are indispensable for integrated operations.

Increasing recourse to the United Nations, particularly when it comes to initiating peace operations, is pushing the United Nations to the limits of its organizational and financial resources. This means that in the future the United Nations will have to rely more on regional organizations and structures to carry out peace operations and other missions. The Charter makes provision for this, and the Secretary-General has advanced a similar proposal in his "Agenda for Peace". On one hand, this will relieve the United Nations of some of its commitments; on the other, it will enable regional organizations or structures with greater first-hand knowledge of the conflicts in their parts of the world to contribute more effectively to resolution of the underlying problems.

There are no standard formulas which dictate how these interlocking institutions should interact, and each case will have to be looked at individually to determine which form of cooperation is most suitable.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands has consistently endeavoured to make a high-grade contribution to effective peace operations, to which we feel committed as a Member of the United Nations. The present reorganization of the Netherlands armed forces is specifically geared to enabling our country to participate even more broadly, speedily and effectively in future peace-keeping operations.

The Netherlands believes that adequate preparation and efficient supervision are crucial to the success of peace operations and has accordingly made a number of military officials available to the United Nations.

As peace operations increase in number and scope, so does the need for support from the Secretariat. The Secretariat should be able to expand - and to contract - in proportion to the need for peace-keeping tasks. Whenever expansion is required it should take place at an early stage. The preparation, planning and budgeting that precede the actual operation are precisely the elements that are essential to its success. The budgets currently proposed to the General Assembly for setting up new peace operations are inadequate. This not only makes it difficult for the Member States to reach decisions on the funding of operations, but also indicates that, at the time the budgets are presented, there is no complete picture of the way the operation is to be set up. Obviously, if the number of peace operations decreases, the additional staff at the Secretariat will also no longer be necessary. What I am suggesting here is that any reinforcement be temporary, flexible and prompt.

Apart from proper planning and training, adequate staffing and a satisfactory level of supervision - all of which are indispensable to the success of a peace operation - it is important that United Nations peace forces be on the spot as soon as possible after the decision to deploy them has been made. Otherwise, there is a danger that hostilities will be resumed and thus that the basis for successful implementation of the Security Council mandate will have disappeared before the forces are in position. Speed is therefore of the essence if the use of greater force is to be avoided.

This is possible only if there is a clear picture of the forces that can be made available to the United Nations at short notice. In this connection, the Netherlands welcomes the formation of the stand-by forces planning team, which is engaged in formulating a concept and drawing up an

inventory of rapid deployment forces. The Netherlands has undertaken to communicate by the end of 1993 which Dutch units could be eligible for designation as stand-by forces. The final decision concerning possible deployment of troops will of course always rest with the Netherlands Government.

The growing demands on the United Nations system can be met only if standards of management, administration and accountability are high. The responsibility for determining and maintaining these standards lies first and foremost with ourselves as Member States. It is our responsibility to indicate clear priorities, to ensure consistency in the decisions taken by different United Nations commissions and governing bodies, and to provide the financial resources required to meet agreed priorities.

Much criticism levelled against the Organization indicates a genuine need to improve the functioning and management of the Secretariat. Part of this criticism has its roots in the way Member States discharge their responsibilities: the failure of Governments to set priorities, the adoption of resolutions with unclear objectives and the failure to pay assessed contributions cannot be blamed on the Secretariat.

I am convinced that the vast majority of United Nations staff members are dedicated and loyal international civil servants. We owe them our respect. In areas ranging from the direct provision of health care to non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, many of them work under difficult conditions, some even risking their lives.

But despite the quality and commitment of its staff, the Secretariat should take a long hard look at its own management structure. Key phrases such as management by objectives, transparency and accountability must become household words in United Nations vocabulary. Line managers must be given greater responsibility and should be held accountable for the attainment of predetermined objectives.

Moreover, the Secretariat should respond to criticism in a more satisfactory manner: first of all, by ensuring that justified criticism is acted upon and that corrective measures are taken without delay; and, secondly, by promptly refuting false allegations. In short, the public relations of the United Nations need improvement.

The Secretary-General has taken several commendable initiatives to restructure the Secretariat. The first changes were introduced in the political sectors, and this year the social and economic sectors were reorganized. This restructuring has provided a solid basis for improving effectiveness and coordination. But further measures are required. It is important to maintain the momentum and to provide clear perspectives for United Nations staff members: they should not be kept in the dark about their future status and about the direction of reform. Lingering uncertainty has affected staff morale and thus staff effectiveness.

I have already said that Member States have a responsibility to provide financial resources for agreed priorities and mandated activities. The United Nations cannot be run on a shoestring. Year after year the Organization suffers from long delays in the receipt of assessed contributions. As a result, mandated activities can be implemented only in part or after substantial delay. In the area of peace-keeping, troop contributors unfortunately have to be prepared and able to provide long-term advance financing for peace-keeping operations.

This lack of discipline among Member States forces the Secretariat to spend a great deal of energy attempting to solve incessant liquidity problems. The painful paradox is that the Secretariat's relative success at shoestring budgeting seems to contribute to a further deterioration in payment discipline among Member States. Moreover, the burden of keeping the United Nations in business now lies unfairly with those Member States who make their payments promptly and in full.

A number of Member States appear to make partial payments as an expression of their dissatisfaction with certain aspects of the Organization's work. The United Nations does not serve an *à la carte* menu: dissatisfaction should be voiced in debate and by force of argument, not by withholding assessed contributions.

We shall be considering the recommendations of the Volcker-Ogata report on the financing of the United Nations system during this session. The merits of many of the recommendations are obvious, but generally speaking they can only help to alleviate the immediate problems; they do not go to the heart of the matter. Ultimately, the only solution to the Organization's financial problems - and this cannot be stated often enough - is prompt and full payment of assessed contributions by all Member States.

While we insist that Member States meet their financial obligations, we also expect the Secretariat to use its financial resources in an efficient and effective manner.

Some Member States have suggested the establishment of new financial control mechanisms. These proposals may have merits, but we should not lose sight of the fact that a number of control mechanisms already exist. I believe that a critical review of the functioning of the present mechanisms is in order before we decide upon new structures.

But auditing alone is insufficient. The structure of the Organization must be such that financial and administrative mismanagement is prevented. Line managers, for example, must be held accountable for budgets under their control. In recent years the Netherlands delegation has presented several ideas aimed at the improvement of the management of United Nations programmes, and these have subsequently been adopted by the General Assembly.

In addition, I advocate greater cost-awareness, not only among United Nations staff but also, and especially, among Member States. It is relatively simple to request the Secretary-General to undertake new activities, call additional meetings or produce reports on a variety of issues. But we must ask ourselves each time whether these requests meet a real need, as they compete for strained financial and staff resources.

Although the resources of the United Nations are limited, genuine priorities must be met. In this respect, at this session the General Assembly will face a particularly difficult task. It will have to determine which activities will receive priority under the regular budget for 1994 and 1995. As new priorities emerge, a number of activities will have to be reduced or even eliminated altogether. We have to live within our means. The Netherlands believes that additional resources are needed most to strengthen the capacity of the United Nations in the area of human rights, to improve the Secretariat's capacity to plan and manage peace-keeping activities and to ensure the effective coordination of humanitarian and emergency operations.

So far I have addressed a number of conditions that will have to be fulfilled if the United Nations is to respond effectively to the new challenges confronting it. A sound financial basis, effective management and the availability of qualified personnel, both at the Secretariat and in the context of peace operations in the field, are the material requirements which must be met. However, no less crucial is the determination actually to implement the resolutions adopted by the Security Council. Decision-making in the Council should reflect the combined political will of its members - acting on behalf of the United Nations Member States - actually to translate their words into action where necessary, once the material conditions have been fulfilled. Too often in the recent past, there has been a failure to take decisive action despite a declared willingness to do so when such action was both necessary and justified.

Irrespective of the detrimental effect this can have on peace operations themselves, it can also cause irreparable damage in the long term to the standing and credibility of the United Nations as a whole. Let me be clear about this: I am not advocating resort to military action at the drop of a hat. But if the Security Council draws a line and says that if the line is crossed military action will be taken, it must be prepared to fulfil this pledge. If such a course proves impossible, then the mandate was not adequately tailored to the situation. If, on the other hand, the mandate is adequate but the Council lacks the will to carry it out, its apparent determination is nothing but an empty threat. Either way, the credibility of the Organization is dealt a severe blow. If this occurs too often, we run the risk that the new decisive United Nations of the post-cold-war era will become a paper tiger, making decisions that it cannot or will not put into practice. This must not be allowed to happen.

Now, more than ever, we need a decisive United Nations and a firm commitment on the part of the Member States. The United Nations needs Member States that pay their dues, provide the Organization with the necessary human resources and have the political will to carry out the decisions which they have collectively arrived at. The Member States need a United Nations which is able to perform those tasks, which operates efficiently and effectively and which can be made accountable for the resources entrusted to it. It is the wish of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that this forty-eighth session of the General Assembly will bring us closer to achieving these aims.

Mr. KRAVCHANKA (Belarus) (*interpretation from Russian*): I wish sincerely to congratulate the representative of Guyana on his unanimous election to the distinguished post of President of the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session. This is an expression of great respect for him and his country. I cannot fail to note the enormous amount of hard and complicated work, deserving of the highest appreciation, that Mr. Stoyan Ganev, a representative of the friendly, fraternal Bulgarian people, carried out in that post.

We welcome and congratulate the Czech Republic, Slovakia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia,

Monaco, Andorra and Eritrea, which have this year become Members of the United Nations.

The end of the twentieth century will undoubtedly go down in history as a time of tectonic shifts in international relations. With our own eyes we have seen the huge tectonic plate of the cold war, with its intense confrontation between two super-Powers and two ideologies, sink into the past. Living space for a new world order has been opened up. What will it look like?

The end of the last century was filled with dire forebodings reflected in a surrealistic quest, and those forebodings have, unfortunately, been borne out. The difficult twentieth century has become the century of confusion for the human soul and human society, and of the extreme tension of antagonisms that have many times brought civilization to the brink of destruction.

Today feelings and expectations are different. At the end of the century, it would seem, the foundation is being laid for harmonizing new ways of life in the international community.

But the establishment of a new world order is not as painless as one might imagine. Changes in the balance of power and the dynamism of international relations often mutate unforeseeably into chaotic scenes of tense contradiction and conflict. World Powers, alliances of States and newly emerged countries are searching for their identity and rethinking their role in an entirely new world.

Not always can an organizing vector or a system of values, guidelines and ideas inspiring all of us be felt in this world.

In this situation, there is a new perception of the potential role of the United Nations. I believe that this organizing role of the United Nations is more lofty, more significant and more realistic than the one formerly assigned to it in the post-war decades, which in fact was unfeasible in the context of confrontation between the super-Powers. It is precisely this role for the United Nations in a new world that the Republic of Belarus advocates most actively.

It is at this precise moment that the potential of both the United Nations Charter and the Organization itself as a centre for harmonizing and coordinating the action of nations is being realized. The United Nations, as the Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, has emphasized is truly becoming irreplaceable.

Undoubtedly, the new role of the United Nations requires a new level of efficiency in the Organization, particularly in its main bodies - the Security Council and the General Assembly. The Republic of Belarus supports the reforms aimed at helping the Organization adapt to the fundamentally new realities and making the procedures of its main bodies more democratic. But in surging forward, one should not lose contact with the ground under one's feet. Reforms, responsibilities and the future are those reference points on which we believe we should constantly focus our attention.

At this decisive moment, the Security Council is becoming the centre of attention, like a magic crystal ball in which one can discern the future. Naturally, reforming the Council, including expanding its membership, requires an especially responsible approach. Mindful that in these new conditions, this most important United Nations body cannot remain the same as it was designed and created almost half a century ago, we support a careful search for consensus on all issues related to its reform. Changes in the Security Council - especially today, when its work has become much more intensive - should not hamper the productiveness of its efforts. To a large extent these efforts depend, in our view, on well-coordinated activities among all of the Council's 15 members, on their adherence to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the Organization and on their highly conscientious, responsible attitude, proved, through real deeds, to the entire international community.

The Republic of Belarus, as representatives know, is one of the candidates for a non-permanent seat on the Security Council for 1994 to 1995. Today, on the eve of the golden jubilee of the United Nations, the fiftieth anniversary of its creation, it is appropriate to recall that at the time of the inception of the World Parliament back in 1945, Belarus was a founding member of the United Nations, having been among the first to sign its Charter.

It is appropriate to recall here that we have gained a certain amount of experience through working in the Security Council from 1974 to 1975. It is also true that we have been represented in that important body the fewest number of times compared to our friends and colleagues in the regional group, but we hope that this injustice will be redressed at the forthcoming elections.

The new historical conditions which led to the creation of the Commonwealth of Independent States, with Minsk as the host city for its coordinating organs, have made us take a fresh look at our role and at our

possibilities of participating in the life of the international community. This is also attested to by the joint support of the Commonwealth and of a number of friendly States for Belarus's candidature for non-permanent membership in the Security Council. For us, the submission of the candidature of the Republic of Belarus for membership in the Security Council does not represent merely a spontaneous political gesture nor a hankering for pro-forma prestige. Historical circumstances are such that the experience and the potential of Belarus, at this very difficult moment in the formation of a new world order, can be of great importance to the international community.

Let us take a look at this experience and potential in those areas which have become very important for preserving global peace and security, as is widely recognized and attested to even by this current debate.

I deal first with the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. As representatives are aware, Belarus is one of the four States that inherited strategic nuclear potential from the former Soviet Union. In our case, this is an important modern arsenal located in the heart of the European continent on mobile strategic missiles. It directly affects global security, the nuclear balance and nuclear non-proliferation. Belarus, however, renounces the prestige of a nuclear State, the sword of Damocles referred to here by President Clinton, and has chosen non-nuclear status.

Having made the appropriate commitments, we are fulfilling them in practice. In 1992 we were the first to remove tactical nuclear weapons from our territory; in fact, that was done ahead of schedule. Last February, the Parliament of Belarus virtually unanimously ratified the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I) and the Lisbon Protocol to that Treaty, and also took the decision to accede, as a non-nuclear State, to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In July of this year the instruments of accession were deposited in Washington, Moscow and London.

I wish to emphasize that since May 1992 - that is, since the signing of the Lisbon Protocol - we have never given any grounds for anyone to doubt the honesty, logic and consistency of our actions. Of all the States which are the nuclear heirs to the Soviet Union, Belarus was the first, and still the only one, to have rejected nuclear weapons in practice. Moreover, it did so without any preconditions or reservations. Thus, for the first time in the history of the international community, a sovereign State has voluntarily renounced a real opportunity to possess and develop nuclear potential. This is truly a large-scale contribution by Belarus to global security and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. I wish to emphasize once again that our words and deeds are not at variance.

Having put forward from this lofty rostrum in 1990 the idea of creating a non-nuclear belt from the Baltic to the Black Sea, we have, to the best of our abilities, been transforming our territory into part of such a belt. We hope that in due course our idea will be supported and developed by our neighbours.

Of great concern to the international community is the threat of illegal exports from the territory of the former Soviet Union of nuclear materials, technology and equipment, which can fall into irresponsible hands. Responding to this danger, Belarus was the first State of the region to enter into a large-scale agreement with the United States to set up a stringent system for export control. Work on implementing this agreement is already under way.

Other initiatives put forward by my country are no less familiar to the United Nations. After many years of effort by Belarus, there has been agreement on international machinery that has the potential to prevent States from replenishing their arsenals with new types of weapons of mass destruction. During this session we intend to continue our active work in this area.

Taking an authoritative position on these issues, Belarus, on behalf of and on the instructions of the States of the Commonwealth of Independent States, intends during this session to present a joint declaration by the Commonwealth of Independent States on issues of the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems.

I turn now to reductions in conventional weapons. Our country does not manufacture battle tanks, and never has. Yet we now have more tanks per capita than any other European State - another part of the difficult heritage of the former Soviet Union. When we decided to accede to the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe, we knew full well that Belarus would have to eliminate 1.7 times more tanks than the United States, 10 times more than the United Kingdom and 50 times more than France. That disproportionate burden is not taken into consideration in the Treaty, since the Republics of the former Soviet Union had no opportunity to participate in its preparation.

At stake, however, was the fate of a highly important international agreement on which many European countries

had been working for more than 20 years, and so as not to torpedo all that work and set Europe back many years we undertook that excessive burden, at great cost to ourselves. Now, Belarus is making an enormous contribution to strengthening regional and international security by destroying the weapons of what was the most powerful military tank district in the former Soviet Union. We are doing this with extreme difficulty, because of the problems of the present transitional period. I would note that this often results in a lack of understanding among our own people: during an energy crisis, we are destroying tanks while we lack the energy resources to carry out our crop-sowing campaign.

Weapons are immoral, just as the Moloch of war is immoral. But the process of disarmament has turned out to be far from idyllic: a catch-phrase of our century - "Guns before butter" - has been fulfilled in a most unexpected way, for the destruction of the guns has done nothing to increase the supply of butter.

In reducing its conventional weapons, Belarus is guided by the interests of all, and is entitled to expect reciprocity from other States in overcoming its difficulties.

On the whole, the heritage of the former Soviet Union has been a difficult one: an economy among the most highly militarized, and large military contingents. Suffice it to say that at the start of 1992 there were three times as many soldiers and officers per thousand civilians on our territory as there were on average in the USSR.

Working sincerely to keep Belarus neutral, our Parliament and our Government have adopted a policy intended to demilitarize the national economy, including a 50 per cent reduction in our army over five years and the development and adoption of a defensive military doctrine.

Having lived over the centuries through the horror of numerous wars, and having lost in their flames millions upon millions of its citizens, the Republic of Belarus will do its utmost to ensure that the firestorm of military confrontation will never again consume its territory.

I shall deal now with ethnic conflicts.

Acute and bloody ethnic, religious and intercommunal clashes have become a dangerous feature of the new world. The deep, often irrational, roots of these conflicts pose an especially difficult challenge to the entire international community, for they do not respond to simple prescriptions for settlement. In Belarus, profound social transformations are taking place against a background of unique mutual tolerance among varied ethnic, cultural and religious groups within our society. Not a single drop of blood has stained the soil of Belarus during this difficult time of transition. We shall continue to do our best so that Belarus, nestled in the very heart of the European continent, can continue to set an example of political, ethnic and religious balance.

Mr. Nyakyi (United Republic of Tanzania), Vice-President, took the Chair.

Belarus is unique in its humanistic spirit, which can guarantee stability and irreversible democratic reform, and we sincerely offer to the Security Council our experience of coexistence among different ethnic groups and the centuries-old tradition of national, cultural and religious tolerance that is a feature of our country.

I am sure that tolerance can be an important key to the resolution of any conflict. With international effort, we can succeed. It was tolerance in the highest sense of the word that made possible a recent handshake, which finally opened the way to what had seemed the impossible: a Middle East settlement. It is tolerance that will determine the success of the process under way in South Africa, and it is a lack of tolerance that is delaying the settlement of the crisis in Bosnia.

Instability; ethnic and religious clashes; ethnic and regional separatism; internal political strife: they have all reached tragic levels in the post-Soviet areas. In a number of cases, they have grown into local military conflicts, and even wars. The internal stability of Belarus and its position at the centre - serving as host to the coordinating bodies of the Commonwealth of Independent States - give Belarus the potential to be a peacemaking mediator in such conflicts.

For example, we sincerely wish to help settle the problem of Nagorny-Karabakh. Belarus remains ready to assist in convening the international conference on Nagorny-Karabakh, under the auspices of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), to be held in our capital, Minsk, on a date to be determined by the participants.

We believe that the neutrality proclaimed by Belarus is an international asset. This constitutional objective enables us to adopt a wider, unbiased approach to determining our positions on various issues. We do this taking due account of the realities of today's world and of

our place in that world. We strive to pursue our policies in such a way as to lay the foundation for a prosperous and neutral Belarus. Specifically, we are moving towards the development and implementation of the principles of democracy.

The Belarus Parliament is in the final stages of considering our new Constitution, which will consolidate the irreversibility of the democratization of our State. We are building a new political structure: new political parties, national, social and political movements, and hundreds of civic organizations have been officially registered and have begun their political activities.

Among these organizations is the League for the Protection of Human Rights. The evolving human-rights status of Belarus is up to international standards. As early as 1991 we ratified the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and recognized the competence of the Human Rights Committee, in keeping with article 41 of the Covenant.

Belarus commends the results of the second World Conference on Human Rights, held this year in Vienna. The Conference in particular reiterated the obligations of States to ensure completely and effectively all human rights and fundamental freedoms without any discrimination whatever against persons belonging to national minorities. We attach great importance to this provision.

Belarus has created and is still creating all the necessary conditions for national minorities that live in its territory so that they can fully enjoy human rights. But at the same time we are far from being indifferent to the treatment of Belarusians who live beyond our national territory and will continue in future to follow closely the situation of more than 2 million ethnic Belarusians who live in different countries of the world.

Economic reforms are gaining ground in the Republic. A gradual movement towards a market economy has increased the level of openness of the economy and has limited the State's monopoly in a number of areas of life. Concrete steps towards creating a private sector have been taken. The law on private landed property, which is of fundamental importance in this respect, has been in force since 1 September. The adoption of these legislative acts, like the laws on property, entrepreneurship, and foreign investment, has created the basis for the further development of market relations. Right now Belarus is on the threshold of a wider stage of its privatization.

The Republic of Belarus, like other States of this region, is vitally concerned about developing and strengthening multilateral cooperation in the economic field. We believe that there are forms of discrimination and limitation with respect to the States of Central and Eastern Europe which should, along with the cold war, become a thing of the past. Any delay here will be at variance with the political and economic realities of the world.

Belarus is striving to lift barriers and limitations in the field of trade and has taken a decision to start negotiations on its accession to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). We also hope that very soon the Uruguay Round will be successfully completed.

Integration on a new level of economic activity within the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) is especially urgent for us. Belarus was one of the main initiators for setting up an economic union within the framework of the CIS and of concluding an appropriate agreement to that effect. It is with great pleasure that I state that an agreement on setting up such an economic union was signed recently, under the chairmanship of Mr. Shushkevich, in Moscow at the meeting of the Council of Heads of State of the CIS.

This opens up favourable prospects for the economic stabilization of the Commonwealth of Independent States and for the gradual overcoming of the most acute problems of this transitional stage. I am convinced that the agreements reached in Moscow will mark a transition towards radically new relations, that is, market relations, and will inevitably lead to the formation on that basis of the eastern European commonwealth, a geopolitical and economic group of a market type that will gradually, but at the same time consistently and unswervingly, become integrated into European and world economic structures.

These new prospects encourage us also because they will help Belarus, I hope, in the near future to strengthen its real capacity to pay and settle to a large extent the problem of our financial obligations to the United Nations.

We are well aware of the acuteness of the financial situation of the Organization. That is why, despite our own extremely difficult economic and financial situation, the Government of Belarus recently made a contribution amounting to $3.5 million to the budget of the Organization and, in effect, has fully settled its arrears. I wish to assure Members of the United Nations that we will

continue to do what we can within our very limited resources. But the United Nations itself through its main organ the General Assembly must take steps to have the financial obligations of Belarus strictly match our real capacity to pay. In particular the new realities warrant a decision without further delay on the relocation of our country from Group B to Group C in the scheme of the apportionment of expenses for United Nations peace-keeping operations.

At the beginning of my statement I mentioned the great hopes for the future which Belarus places on United Nations activities. However, there is one very special area for us in which United Nations assistance is vitally important, and that is the environment and our "eternal wound that does not heal" - Chernobyl - the most terrible nuclear disaster.

Along with the growth of cancer, especially among children, of great concern to us recently has been the social and psychological stress among our people. The birth rate has fallen dramatically and the number of psychogenic diseases has been growing rapidly. People are overwhelmed by a concern about their health and the health of their children. This has also affected the pace of the Republic's transition to new social and economic realities. We call upon the United Nations, in close cooperation with the Commission of the European Communities, to continue their efforts to further study and overcome the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster. We hope that in the process of reforming the United Nations system and its Secretariat the necessary institutional and programme mechanisms will be worked out to further carry out Chernobyl-related activities in the interests of the entire international community, taking into consideration the great significance and uniqueness of the lessons of the Chernobyl tragedy.

The activities carried out by the new United Nations Coordinator on Chernobyl, Mr. Jan Eliasson, the beginning of whose work is greatly appreciated by us, gives us hope that the United Nations potential will be used actively enough to yield tangible practical results.

In the post-Chernobyl era we need moral and psychological support, sometimes simply compassion. In this connection I should like to recall the words of a great Russian writer, Fyodor Dostoyevsky, who is connected to Belarus by birth. He once declared that beauty and the nobility of human relations would save the world. To that I would add compassion because they in effect are inseparable since beauty is always noble while compassion and nobility are always beautiful.

Belarus, living through the post-Chernobyl nightmare, having over centuries survived the nightmare of many raids, invasions and wars, poverty and hardship, understands the pain, the suffering, of the peoples of the developing countries as no other country does. Poverty, diseases, child mortality, in many parts of the world cannot leave people of good will indifferent. Indeed it is immoral to fail to take note of this. I am convinced that the new world order will entail a fairer distribution of the world's wealth and it will be marked by assistance to those who for decades have been unjustifiably doomed to poverty, stagnation and predictable backwardness and have had to be content with the remaining crumbs of the wealth produced by them but then redistributed and not in their favour.

As one of the original members of the Commission on Sustainable Development, our country is striving to contribute to its work in a way that reflects the ecological and economic interests of all groups of States in a balanced manner. We support efforts to elaborate an international convention on desertification; the search for a solution to the problems of the small developing island States; and the search for new and additional resources for developing countries.

Aware, under the conditions of post-Chernobyl realities, of the significance of ecological problems in finding a solution, Belarus has been actively supporting the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the first-ever summit in history held in the interests of the Earth. The Parliament of the Republic of Belarus has already ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity and is now examining the issue of acceding to the Convention on Climate Change. We support priority consideration of ecological problems within the context of international cooperation, and the Republic of Belarus supports the idea of transforming, in the near future, the Commission on Sustainable Development into the United Nations council on ecological security. We are ready to contribute to the elaboration of its structure and mandate.

The United Nations is moving from the old epoch to the new one with an imposing baggage. Certain parts of it have already become obsolete and will be of interest only to historical researchers; others contain the grains of that new future role to be played by the United Nations in this quickly evolving world which I have already spoken about - for example, a positive and future-oriented

experience of large-scale peace-keeping operations in Namibia and Cambodia. Standing on the threshold of the third millennium, one can hardly envisage all of the details of the general picture of the future world. However, the prospects that lie ahead are what matters most, and they are clearly visible. From the role of cease-fire organizer to the role of peace guarantor, from the role of peace guarantor to the role of co-organizer of life in the international community, a wise and authoritative arbitrator whose political will is without doubt recognized by all: that is the way we see the role of the United Nations in the next century. Meeting the challenges of the time, Belarus is ready to work together with other friendly States, including, if this is the will of the General Assembly, within the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. POOS (Luxembourg): First of all, I should like to extend to the President of the General Assembly at this forty-eighth session my sincere congratulations on his election. He was unanimously supported for this position because of his excellent qualities; and his election is also a tribute to his country, Guyana.

Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, our Secretary-General, also deserves our wholehearted thanks and appreciation for his constant and resolute efforts in implementing the decisions of our Organization and applying the principles of our Charter.

The already very broad universality of the United Nations has been further strengthened - and I welcome this - with the admission of six new countries: the Czech Republic, the Slovak Republic, Eritrea, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Monaco and Andorra.

Mr. Willy Claes, the Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs, yesterday expressed the views of the European Community and its member States. I shall therefore be able in this statement to focus on a few matters of particular concern to my Government.

Three years ago, from this very rostrum, we welcomed the end of the East-West confrontation and its corollary, the end of the threat of nuclear annihilation. Throughout the world, democracy and respect for the state of law were progressing in a most encouraging way. But given developments in the last few years, it would seem that we should somehow dampen our enthusiasm.

Changes in the balance of forces between the Powers that dominated the old order have allowed nationalism and regionalism to develop. In some cases, this has led to the destabilization of entire regions following upon rivalries between neighbors, ethnic tension and religious fanaticism.

Nationalism is of course not in and of itself evil. It is in some sense a logical manifestation of feelings of pride and self-confidence which can finally express themselves after long years of oppression during which free speech was forcibly repressed.

But once the legitimate expression of this regained pride of a people is transformed into open hostility towards everything that is different, then nationalism carries within itself the seeds of grave danger.

Extreme nationalism can be seen in many places, whether it be in the territory of the former Soviet Union or the former Yugoslavia, where it has found its most intolerable expression. It leads to explosions of violence, armed aggression, acts of terrorism and unspeakable suffering for the civilian populations.

Ethnic conflicts are proliferating in all regions of the world. In Western Europe itself, it can be seen in the resurgence of racist and xenophobic incidents.

As a challenge to the primacy of law and to respect for human rights, extreme nationalism constitutes a threat to the international order.

A clear and coherent strategy is necessary to respond to this challenge.

First of all, education with regard to tolerance should be renewed; and, secondly, legal protection for minorities must be ensured.

The principles and rules drawn up in this area by the Council of Europe and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe might suggest some solutions. New instruments are to be defined next week at the summit of the Council of Europe. The plan for stability in Europe is part of this same approach.

Thirdly - and this is the most important action to be taken - we must do everything possible at the national, regional and international levels to strengthen democratization and to promote protection for human rights.

It is on the basis of these principles, focused on the free expression of peoples and the development of

democratic structures, that the United Nations has proposed solutions and agreements to resolve the conflicts which are being submitted to it in ever-increasing numbers.

The Government of Luxembourg expresses its deep satisfaction over the agreement on mutual recognition and the agreement on the autonomy of occupied territories concluded between Israel and the Palestinian Liberation Organization.

We should like to pay tribute to those who forged the agreements, in particular Prime Minister Rabin, his Foreign Minister Peres and President Arafat. They have given the world a lesson in courage and clarity of vision and in political realism as well.

The developments we have witnessed are of a historic significance comparable to that of the collapse of the Berlin Wall. They fundamentally change the facts of the Middle East; they have launched a process of reconciliation in order to put an end to an explosive, untenable and unjust situation.

In a region devastated by more than 40 years of war, violence and hatred, a window is now opening on a more peaceful and democratic future. The still fragile dynamic that has been created must be strengthened without delay.

This can first be achieved by the conclusion of peace agreements between Israel and its neighbours: Lebanon, Jordan and Syria. The Government of Luxembourg encourages the leaders concerned to overcome the last obstacles and to open the way to normalization of their relations with Israel.

The Israelis and the Palestinians must then act together and in good faith, with the solidarity of the regional and international community to implement successfully the agreement on autonomy in the occupied territories, the first step towards a comprehensive settlement. The first contributor of funds, the European Community and its member States, is prepared to increase cooperation on behalf of a population that must be helped to emerge from poverty and build a more dignified and prosperous future. Our Government will participate fully in that effort.

Thanks to the United Nations, peace was restored in Namibia and Nicaragua three years ago.

Today in Cambodia the effort led by the United Nations has enabled the people of an ancient culture, humiliated by decades of bloody oppression and foreign occupation, to participate on a mass scale in free and open elections. By consolidating a State of law and national reconciliation, the country will be able to rebuild itself.

In Haiti a firm policy of close cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of American States (OAS) has led to an agreement which provides for the restoration of democracy.

In El Salvador the assistance of the United Nations was decisive in putting an end to the civil war and recommencing the construction of a civilian society and the process of national reconciliation. Free elections in which all Salvadorians will be able to participate are to be held next year.

In Somalia, however, intervention by the United Nations has demonstrated the limits of armed intervention in a tribal civil war in the absence of a political agreement and a cease-fire. Nevertheless, the difficulties encountered in Mogadishu should not make us forget that the United Nations made an essential contribution to combating the famine.

In South Africa further decisive progress is being made towards the definitive abolition of apartheid. I welcome the agreement on setting up a transitional body to draw up a provisional Constitution and prepare for free elections in April 1994. Only a shared determination and close cooperation between all the parties will make it possible to stop the deadly violence which continues to kill and which jeopardizes the process of reconciliation.

Significant progress towards restoring democracy and towards national reconciliation has also been made in other countries in Central America and in Africa.

Those achievements, however imperfect, are encouraging, and demonstrate the role that our Organization can play in preserving peace and consolidating democratic regimes.

The situation in the former Yugoslavia is still extremely disturbing. Every day we see on television the barbarism that accompanies "ethnic cleansing" and the bloodstained dismemberment of Bosnia and Herzegovina - a country which was once an example of ethnic and religious coexistence.

The agreement between the three Bosnian parties, which has yet to be finalized, is admittedly complex and far from perfect. Yet it has the merit of opening up the prospect of putting an end to terror and violence. It offers a comprehensive arrangement for emerging from the crisis. Its success, which is far from being assured, presupposes a real desire on the part of the three parties to reach agreement and to carry out and abide by what is signed. The European Community and its member States, where necessary assisted by the Western European Union (WEU), are ready to contribute to implementation of the agreement, in cooperation with the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). Sanctions could be lifted when the various Security Council resolutions on the former Yugoslavia have been implemented and when a satisfactory solution to the problem of minorities has been found.

Overall, our Organization's peace-keeping activities have reached an unprecedented level. Almost 80,000 Blue Helmets, military and civilian, are in the field in an unparalleled number of humanitarian missions and peace-keeping operations. I pay tribute to all those who serve the cause of peace and in particular to those who have lost their lives during these actions. We have a duty to ensure better security for personnel.

Luxembourg, itself born as a modern State of an international treaty guaranteed by the Powers of the time, is particularly sensitive to the need for security and the need to preserve the peace. It has therefore contributed actively to United Nations peace-keeping operations, sending military personnel and making suitable financial contributions. My Government intends to continue this cooperation in the future.

Luxembourg also firmly supports the efforts to step up United Nations activities in the area of preventive diplomacy. These efforts must be increased. Measures such as fact-finding missions, the use of rapid alert systems, the establishment of a rapid deployment group, and a reinforcement of the roles of regional organizations could all be very useful in preventing conflict. Once a conflict has been unleashed it requires a much more costly intervention to ensure the restoration of peace.

New cooperation is developing between the United Nations and regional organizations, which will increasingly be called upon to carry out peace-keeping functions at their level or to support and supplement United Nations activities in the area of collective security. The WEU, of which my country currently holds the presidency, is in the course of defining its role in peace-keeping operations. NATO and the CSCE are doing likewise.

The preservation of peace and the promotion of democracy and the rule of law go hand in hand with the protection of human rights.

Over the years, our Organization has succeeded in developing and progressively codifying human rights. But that is not enough; we must also see to it that these rights are better respected. The annual reports of organizations involved in the defence of human rights show that we are still far from attaining that objective.

We are pleased that the Vienna Conference on Human Rights allowed encouraging progress to be made. The universality of human rights was clearly affirmed. Specific proposals were made for ensuring broader knowledge of human rights, promoting them and respecting them. It is now for this Assembly to approve those proposals, including the establishment of a High Commissioner for Human Rights.

There is an indissoluble link between respect for human rights and the promotion of democracy. Within the United Nations system this link takes concrete form in the Organization's growing activities in the area of technical assistance and international supervision of electoral processes. I support the proposals by our Secretary-General to broaden these support activities to include the establishment of a free press, political parties and an independent judiciary.

In this context, I welcome the decision taken by President Yeltsin to organize free elections in order to ensure democratic legitimacy for all State bodies in Russia.

The United Nations must also increase its activities in the economic, social and environmental areas. This will also require the continued courageous reform of its structures and working methods.

We can have no lasting peace while peoples are subjected to abject poverty and famine and while they have no hope for progress towards greater justice and equality. Cooperation and trade: these are the two foci of a single policy, which must be followed. In the past few years my Government has doubled the aid it designates for development and cooperation. We are in favour of the swift conclusion of a balanced agreement in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Such an

agreement can provide at the world level a new impetus to trade and economic relations.

Following the Rio Conference on Environment and Development, the new Commission on Sustainable Development must be determined to ensure that the commitments entered into at that Conference are followed up.

The world's population has more than doubled over the past 40 years and according to estimates will double again in the next 30 years. The international community must engage in a thorough analysis of the consequences of that level of growth - for example, the problems of refugees, urban concentration, and the enormous constraints in the areas of food, housing, health and education. That is why the Conference on Population and Development to be held in Cairo in 1994 has such importance.

It is not surprising that social problems are becoming increasingly important at a time when many economies are facing difficult adjustment processes and others are carrying out a delicate transition from a planned economy to a market economy. Moreover, all recently published reports confirm that there is a disturbing increase in the gap between the richest sectors and the poorest sectors of populations, both within countries and between countries.

The World Summit for Social Development which will take place in 1995 will, if it is adequately prepared, offer the international community an opportunity to develop a strategy to combat poverty and to ensure the better distribution of wealth.

More than a year ago the Secretary-General issued his report "An Agenda for Peace", which was designed to strengthen the Organization's capacities in the area of preventive diplomacy and the maintenance and restoration of peace. Some of the proposals it contains are already being applied in practice, but others are still pending. We hope that the current review of the Agenda will lead to specific results that can meet the Organization's needs.

Reform of the Security Council is a delicate issue which touches on the very heart of international post-war cooperation. The Council has now been in operation for 50 years, and the time has come to have a candid and in-depth discussion of the question. The fiftieth anniversary of the Organization in 1995 could offer us a good opportunity to do this.

The second crisis facing the United Nations - and this point has been emphasized in all the statements made here so far - is the chronic budget deficit. To put it bluntly, the United Nations is bordering on insolvency. This is all the more astonishing in that the annual budget of the Organization is about the same as that of a medium-sized city.

The legal obligation that binds all Member States makes it incumbent on them to pay their financial contributions in full and at the proper time. The credibility and the operational capacity of the United Nations depend on this.

In conclusion, let me turn to an old Europe.

In building European union the members of the European Community have tried to seize an unprecedented opportunity for the entire continent to achieve a truly unified Europe, a Europe of countries that have often made war against each other in the past.

Without denying the current difficulties, I believe that the process of integration being carried out by the European Community can serve as the inspiration for initiatives for regional integration in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

European unification was thought up and implemented on the basis of principles that are still fully valid: reconciliation between peoples that only yesterday were enemies; broad-ranging political, economic, commercial and cultural cooperation; and the development of a social model based on pluralistic democracy, the market economy and solidarity. Such a model guarantees justice and social cohesion even if we are never able to make it perfect and it must be constantly adjusted.

It is on the basis of these common values that all the peoples of Europe can, for the first time in their history, build their future together. I believe that at the world level also, thanks to concerted international action, we will be in a better position to overcome the obstacles to peace and to create a world order that is more democratic, more tolerant, more just and more social - in a word, more in keeping with the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. HAN (Republic of Korea): May I congratulate Ambassador Insanally of Guyana on his assumption of the presidency of the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session. I also wish to acknowledge the excellent work done by His Excellency Ambassador Stoyan Ganev of Bulgaria as President of the last session of the General Assembly.

I also pay tribute to the Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, for his dedication to the cause of the United Nations and to its reform at this important juncture.

Allow me to take this opportunity to express my warmest welcome to the new Member States - Andorra, the Czech Republic, Eritrea, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Monaco and the Slovak Republic. My delegation wishes them every success and looks forward to working closely with them in all areas.

We live in an age of historic transition. This is confirmed by the dramatic changes in the international situation since the last session. A new world order, which is fundamentally different from the old one, is taking shape. We are witnessing a trend towards peace, cooperation and interdependence, instead of conflict, confrontation and ideological bigotry. The most resounding testimony to this effect emerged in the peace accord between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization signed in Washington this month.

Today we find ourselves in an international environment that was only a vision to the founding fathers of the United Nations. I should like to quote from the remarks of Mr. Oswaldo Aranha, a distinguished diplomat from Brazil, who was the President of the General Assembly in 1947. He said:

> "All idea of force is today obsolete and negative. The old order, based on political power, is trying to survive, but there is no longer room for predominance through force. The United Nations stands for the new order, based on peaceful accord, on understanding, on free discussion ... and on the common and equal responsibility of peoples." *(Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Plenary Meeting," 128th meeting, p. 1442)*

Forty-five years after these words were spoken, we finally stand at the end of one era and on the threshold of a new one. This may be a second, and perhaps the last, opportunity for us to fulfil the stated mission of the United Nations at its creation.

To be sure, the end of the cold war does not mean the end of all problems. The world worries about the continuing and even worsening ethnic and religious conflicts. We face the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Environmental protection is another major challenge to today's world. Development cannot be taken for granted. These are monumental issues that require the collective efforts of all members of the international community, and of the United Nations in particular.

We have entered an age of diversity and uncertainty, but we should not be daunted by this new reality. We may not be accustomed to it, but we should not be afraid of living in a pluralistic world. Nations differ in what they want to achieve and in how they want to achieve it. These diverse goals, while constituting a possible source of conflict, should also form the basis for complementarity and cooperation among nations.

Some say that bipolarity is being replaced by multipolarity. Yet "pluralistic", rather than "multipolar", is perhaps more precise a term to describe the emerging world order. A multipolar world would postulate geopolitics based upon conflict and balance of power. A pluralistic world, on the other hand, accepts diversity and encourages cooperation. Thus, the world has the potential to become more democratic and harmonious than it has ever been in history.

One of the most noteworthy changes in the aftermath of the cold war is the strengthening of the United Nations, particularly in the field of peace and security. The "Agenda for Peace" report that Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali submitted last year provides a solid base on which to augment the role of the United Nations in this area.

Preventive diplomacy, in particular, is of the utmost importance, given the enormous human and material costs of conflicts once they break out. My delegation will continue its participation in the efforts to translate into a meaningful reality such initiatives as "preventive diplomacy" and "post-conflict peace-building".

As the continuing tragedies in Bosnia and Somalia demonstrate, conflicts fuelled by ethnic and religious differences, poverty and internal disorder are becoming a new and major threat to international security. In response to increasing demands, 17 United Nations peace-keeping operations are active in different parts of the world.

However, traditional peace-keeping may no longer be a sufficient response to current conflicts. We find that the scope of these operations is widening, ranging from the supervision of a cease-fire to nation-building. Furthermore,

the timely deployment of peace-keepers is imperative to temper a conflict at an early stage.

For this reason, we believe that the proposed mechanism of United Nations stand-by forces is an appropriate way to enhance the Organization's role in meeting new challenges to peace. The availability of stand-by forces will enable the United Nations to provide a quick and effective response to conflicts.

I take this opportunity to reaffirm my Government's support of the United Nations Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM II). We dispatched an engineering battalion in June, and we urge all the factions concerned in Somalia to cooperate fully with the United Nations. Given the successful precedent set by the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC), I am confident that UNOSOM II will also fulfill its peacekeeping mission.

None the less, it is a source of grave concern that the number of United Nations casualties in Somalia is sharply increasing. Effective arrangements need to be worked out to enhance the safety and security of those who are involved in the United Nations peace-keeping operations there and everywhere else.

In the domain of peace and security, preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, both nuclear and biochemical, is another critical task.

The Republic of Korea strongly supports the efforts to stop nuclear-weapons proliferation beyond 1995 through the extension of the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty (NPT). We also support the strengthening of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards as the central device for ensuring the effectiveness of the NPT.

At the same time, consistent with the spirit and objective of the NPT, we urge the existing nuclear Powers not oniy to accelerate their efforts to reduce their nuclear arsenal but also actively to join the efforts for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. That will encourage non-nuclear countries to adhere and agree to an indefinite extension of the NPT régime. My delegation welcomes the commitment of nuclear-weapon States to a continuing moratorium on nuclear testing.

With regard to chemical and biological weapons, the conclusion of the chemical weapons Convention in January was a big step forward. We urge those States that have not yet joined the Convention to do so as early as possible. The Convention, together with the biological weapons Convention, will serve as a major instrument in preventing proliferation of biochemical weapons.

With the ending of the cold war, disarmament has moved into the realm of real possibility. Over the past few years disarmament has gained momentum with agreements on nuclear-arms reduction and cut-backs in conventional forces. We have to keep this momentum alive. In the light of these developments, the October 1992 report of the Secretary-General on "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold war era" has offered timely and useful guidelines for disarmament.

At the same time, we should take note of the ongoing reassessment of multilateral disarmament machinery. The Conference on Disarmament is particularly important as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum. In my delegation's view, the Conference on Disarmament should be appropriately expanded in membership to reflect the changed international environment.

In addition, the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms that was launched with the participation of more than 70 Member States should be implemented on a universal basis as soon as possible.

As I discuss the issue of disarmament, I need to draw attention to the Korean peninsula. Despite the worldwide trends towards peace and cooperation, there is still tension in Korea.

My Government believes that the solution to the inter-Korean question should be sought in the context of the post-cold-war international order of reconciliation and cooperation. This means active participation by both North and South Korea in the regional and global order.

We are particularly concerned with the North Korean nuclear programme. North Korea should cooperate in removing any suspicions surrounding it by honouring its non-proliferation obligations under the NPT.

In conformity with the Security Council resolution 825 (1993), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea must comply with its safeguards agreement with IAEA. At the same time, we urge the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to cooperate with us in implementing the 1991 inter-Korean Joint Declaration of the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.

My delegation is also deeply concerned about the safety of North Korean nuclear power reactors. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the countries concerned should pay special attention to the safety issue as well as to the non-proliferation question in relation to the North Korean nuclear program.

There are several urgent issues of a non-military nature whose solution requires a global approach. Development and trade, environment, and human rights are some of them.

The post-cold war international environment both requires and enables us to place greater emphasis on economic and social development. We should now devote the peace dividend to development efforts. Given the high degree of interdependence in today's world, no country is immune from the consequences of economic difficulties in other countries. Poverty, population problems and environmental degradation have become a common threat to the well-being of mankind. These non-military crises are now the issues to be addressed with a sense of urgency and collective endeavour by all nations.

The role of the United Nations in this area should be strengthened. I welcome the recent initiatives to restructure and revitalize the United Nations system in the economic and social field. The structure of the system should be streamlined for effective mobilization of limited resources. Meanwhile, I believe a substantial increase in development resources is necessary to support developmental cooperation. Developed countries are encouraged to enhance their efforts in this area.

To achieve a more prosperous world, we need to strengthen the global free trade regime. The regime of the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade (GATT) was created shortly after the founding of the United Nations. The underlying philosophy was clear: peace and security can best be guaranteed if buttressed by economic prosperity. During the cold-war period, this global free trade regime exceeded early expectations by bringing wealth and prosperity to those who embraced it. Now that the cold war is over, the whole world can more fully benefit from it.

Our choice is clear. We must strengthen the free trade system, by ensuring a successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round.

Economic development is closely linked with the environment issue. It was at the Rio Summit last year that the world was keenly awakened to this critical issue. The Summit emphatically stressed the importance of global partnership to achieve environmentally sound and sustainable development towards the twenty-first century.

When we deal with environmental problems, it is important to strike a balance between the North and the South. The former focuses on the primacy of environmental protection while the latter emphasizes the development imperatives. We believe that the Commission on Sustainable Development is a very appropriate forum for seeking such a balance and coordinating the implementation of the results of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development.

As a member of the Commission on Sustainable Development, the Republic of Korea is ready to do its part in contributing to global action. We hope to help bridge the divergences between the developed and the developing countries. We are now in the process of joining the Framework Convention on Climate Change and other environmental agreements.

The human rights issue is receiving growing attention on the international level. This may be a natural phenomenon as the emerging pluralistic world society facilitates the promotion of democracy all over the world. At the World Conference on Human Rights held in Vienna in June, I had the privilege to report to the forum that human rights have finally come of age in Korea. I also pledged our firm support for the international movements to promote human rights.

The Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action are the most significant results of the Conference. We must take the necessary follow-up measures. In five years we will commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948. I hope that our generation will be able to meet the expectation set by those who produced this Declaration.

As we pay due attention to the human rights issue, we should also concern ourselves with the question of refugees and disadvantaged groups. Armed conflicts and natural disasters around the world raise the need for humanitarian assistance and protection of refugees and displaced persons. The Republic of Korea's recent accession to the Convention relating to the status of refugees testifies to its commitment to this cause.

I attach special significance to the World Summit for Social Development which will take place in 1995 in

Copenhagen. I hope that effective programmes of action will be put forward at this Conference to tackle major impediments to social development.

As the United Nations faces new opportunities and challenges, it also needs reforms in order to cope with them better. This is indeed a tall order.

We believe that, with the enormous increase in the general membership of the United Nations, it has become necessary to enlarge the Security Council. The question is how to enlarge the Council without sacrificing its effectiveness. The creation of a third category, with long-term membership but without the power of veto, coupled with the expansion of the non-permanent membership, may be an answer.

Concerning the General Assembly, the simplification of the committee structure, through the merger of the Fourth Committee and the Special Political Committee, will undoubtedly enhance its efficiency. The rationalization of the agenda may be another measure to help enhance the capability of the General Assembly.

My delegation also welcomes the Secretary-General's measures to reform the Secretariat and supports him in this complex task. In particular, the recent establishment of the Office of the Assistant Secretary-General for Inspections and Investigations is an initial step towards increasing the accountability of the Secretariat.

I note with concern the report of the Secretary-General that refers to the financial status of the United Nations. We fully agree with him that in order to enable this Organization to meet the demands of its time, the resources provided should match its political will. My delegation is in favor of constructive discussions during the current session which would explore ways and means of alleviating the current financial difficulties of the United Nations.

I believe the reform should be based on a proper understanding of the changed world situation. It should also conform with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. I hope this process will lead to an efficient and productive United Nations that is truly capable of fulfilling the aspirations of mankind by the year 1995, the world body's fiftieth anniversary.

Given the vital role that the United Nations has played in the Republic of Korea, we will observe this occasion with particular dedication. A national committee will be formed and activities will be coordinated with the Secretariat, with special emphasis on conveying the message of the United Nations to Korea's next generation.

In the Republic of Korea, the new Government has launched a reorientation of foreign policy. Our new diplomacy places emphasis on universal values - peace, democracy, liberty, welfare and human rights. Globalism is at the core of the new diplomacy.

Korea is pursuing a more active role in tackling global issues such as international peace and security, disarmament, the eradication of poverty, protection of the environment and efficient utilization of natural resources. It is through such engagement in global affairs that Korea seeks to play its due part in the activities of the United Nations designed to make the world a safer, more just and more prosperous place.

The Republic of Korea is now participating in the United Nations Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM II). It is also serving a three-year term on the Economic and Social Council. We shall actively seek ways to increase our contribution to international organizations, especially those within the framework of the United Nations.

In this regard, the Republic of Korea hopes to better contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security by having an opportunity to serve on the Security Council. We hope to receive the encouragement and support of the world community in these efforts.

Democratization, and harmony between nations, are the most important trends of the new world order. By drawing upon them, we have the opportunity to make the future more peaceful and secure than ever before in the history of mankind. Our success or failure will depend upon our understanding of the nature of the new order and our ability to build on it.

To be sure, there are dangers also. We failed with the League of Nations. We often experienced bitter frustration during the cold war period. Yet, we are on the threshold of a new beginning. We need to look forward, because the future is in our hands. We have to prove to ourselves that we are equal to the task.

Mr. McKINNON (New Zealand): The United *Nations is our Organization; we are its custodians, and we* have to adjust to change. We have a huge responsibility to pass it on in better shape than we found it. Historians

in future years will acknowledge this period of radical change.

But what are the objectives of this Organization of ours in 1993? Well, they are not very difficult to enumerate, because they are set out for us and by us in the Preamble to the Charter, and they remain as valid today as they were when they were agreed in 1945.

The first, of course, is peace, because without peace and security no human society can flourish; then human dignity, because if we do not treat each other with respect as individuals, we will not do so as nations; justice, because unless relations between nations are grounded in law, the powerful will always be able to triumph over the weak; social and economic progress, because without the sustained and sustainable development of our economies, all our other achievements will be as nothing.

I believe that to this list we must now add the maintenance of a clean and attractive environment. We are learning, painfully, that our planet also has rights. We ignore them only at our peril.

These are the foundations for the vision of what the world should be. In New Zealand, we would say that they give opportunities to all. When the United Nations came into existence almost 50 years ago, the vision was sharper than the reality, but the founders of the United Nations were certainly not deterred. They were at the watershed in the affairs of the world. They had just experienced the awful reality of a global conflict in which millions had died, and they were determined to do everything in their power to make sure that such a conflict could never occur again. They did build well. They embodied their vision not only in this Organization but also in a whole series of economic, financial, social and humanitarian institutions, and they gave it the only strength that counted: their sheer determination, as men and women from very different countries, to make it happen.

Only the utmost patience and perseverance has kept that dream and that determination alive through most of the 50 years since 1945. Progress has been slow and it has been halting. Some great things were done, but too often the Members of the United Nations could agree only at the lowest common denominator, a reflection of the political gaps and strains within the United Nations membership.

There are, however, four reasons why I believe that that long, grey era has closed.

The first is that the cold war, that shadow and threat of a global conflict, is now over. Freed of that constraint, the United Nations can operate, as it was intended that it should, as the ultimate guardian of the security of all its Members, the ultimate arbiter of world peace.

Secondly, democracy, one of the most effective guarantors of peace between nations, is spreading. We welcome the establishment of democratic institutions and processes in countries that have for too long been without them.

The third point is that in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations, the world has a major opportunity to turn its back on protectionism and lock in the prospects for economic growth through trade and other forms of economic integration. Freedom and free trade go hand in hand.

Fourthly, and last, the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro and Agenda 21 contain a global consensus, a universal determination to act to preserve our environment.

This combination of developments marks a new watershed; if we are to keep faith with the founders of this Organization, we must do what they did in 1945 at their watershed, and build well, not just for ourselves, but of course for those who follow.

On the issue of security and peacemaking, the first point that I raised was that the elimination of confrontation between the super-Powers has opened up new possibilities for the practice of collective security and peacemaking. The unfortunate consequence of 50 years of super-Power confrontation is, paradoxically, that we are not yet very good at working together: like a novice sports team, we are really rather uncoordinated, sadly lacking in strategy, sadly lacking in team skills or knowledge of the new rules, and sadly lacking in collective determination. We cannot correct these deficiencies overnight, but we must keep on trying to improve.

The other paradox is that peace has not broken out simply because the former Soviet Union and the United States have stopped squaring off against each other. There have been unexpected consequences: some would liken the result to taking the lid off a pressure-cooker. Conflicts, internal and between neighbours, seem to have burst out everywhere. These consequences, in human terms, are horrific.

So here we are, in the United Nations, underresourced, undertrained and facing an enormous peacemaking, peace-building and peace-keeping challenge. We really have no alternative to learning as we go, and I believe that we are doing so.

During the past year, I have spoken to soldiers and relief workers in the field in United Nations missions as widely spread as Somalia and Croatia, and I pay my highest tribute to their dedication under some of the most adverse circumstances. United Nations people are trying there, as elsewhere, to create conditions where their work will ultimately no longer be required. They are actually trying to do themselves out of a job.

The Secretary-General's document "An Agenda for Peace" is now in a consolidation phase. The problems are clear: rising expectations; machinery due for reform; lack of funds; and the lack of ready, well-trained and well-equipped forces. Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali has already made some thoughtful proposals, including sending teams to Member States to help identify in advance resources available for the United Nations operations. New Zealand is willing to respond positively to this approach.

Mr. HAN (Republic of Korea), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The Secretary-General has also made organizational changes in the Headquarters departments that support peace-keeping. The revamping of the Department of Peace-Keeping Operations is a very good start, providing we recognize that we need more than just a shifting of the resources. The new philosophy of peace-building and peacemaking must work in tandem with the well-tried and successful peace-keeping philosophy of the past.

On the issue of safety and security of United Nations personnel, recent peace-keeping operations have highlighted the risks to United Nations personnel working in dangerous and unstable situations. That does not help the recruitment of peace-keepers, and it does not help the recruitment of contributing countries. The United Nations must have the means to hold personally responsible and accountable those who attack or commit other acts of violence against the United Nations and associated personnel.

Earlier this year the New Zealand Government took the initial step of calling for all possible measures to ensure the safety of United Nations personnel. We asked the Secretary General to report on the adequacy of existing arrangements. His report makes a number of positive recommendations. He has highlighted the need for the General Assembly to elaborate a new multilateral instrument on the role the Security Council might play in setting the appropriate conditions designed to improve the safety of personnel.

I was very pleased just this afternoon to participate in a Security Council meeting that adopted a resolution welcoming the Secretary-General's report and spelling out the conditions the Council will impose in the future for the protection of United Nations personnel. I was also delighted that the General Assembly last week agreed to New Zealand's proposal to include a new item on the safety of personnel in this year's agenda. I hope that the Sixth Committee will establish a working group to consider the issue and make urgent progress. I hope the subject will also be very fully discussed in all other relevant United Nations bodies.

Of course, any mechanisms for protecting peace-keepers must also require that parties to any conflict respect the integrity of those personnel that have been deployed on their behalf. Such an undertaking should, in principle, form part of the mandate for any peace-keeping operation. The recent practice of the Security Council of establishing clear mandates for peace-keeping operations at the outset of deployment is especially welcome, but there remains an onus on a host State both to explain carefully to its people the reason for the United Nations presence and also to take active steps to ensure the safety of United Nations personnel.

But the purpose of peace-keeping or peacemaking and peace-building is not solely to deal with conflicts that have already arisen, urgent though that task is. We must improve our capacity to prevent conflicts before they break out, and I should like to acknowledge here the importance and timeliness of recent improvements in conflict-resolution mechanisms and the ongoing work on preventive diplomacy. I welcome very warmly the contribution made by my Australian colleague, Senator Gareth Evans, to the debate on this subject. He has given us much food for thought and some helpful suggestions for concrete steps we can take to improve our performance in this area.

Disarmament measures remain a key element in conflict prevention. This year, as the international community moves towards the extension - I hope for an indefinite period - of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Assembly will have non-proliferation as one of its major themes. In this

regard, North Korea's continued evasion of its responsibilities under that Treaty demands a firm international response.

We welcome very strongly the restraint being shown by the nuclear-weapon States on testing and their positive attitude towards the launching of negotiations for a comprehensive test-ban treaty. It is not before time. New Zealand has sponsored a draft resolution on comprehensive test-bans for many years. Its purpose now is on the brink of fulfillment. The subject needs to be taken up in the Conference on Disarmament. Given the importance of the tasks now on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament, membership of the Conference must be open to all who have the will to participate constructively.

In respect of conventional weaponry, we applaud the enhancement of controls through the commencement of the Register of conventional-arms transfers. We now have a chemical weapons Convention in place alongside the biological weapons Convention.

It is timely to consider what similar work can be done in respect of conventional weapons. As disarmament moves from the realms of Utopia into the achievable, we must lend every effort, here in the United Nations and outside it, to ensure disarmament's more rapid progress. No sensible proposal should be discarded simply for outdated ideological reasons.

The spread of democratic institutions to every corner of the globe is, I believe, one of the most encouraging phenomena of recent years, and the pace is astonishing. In the space of just 24 hours last week, the Parliament of Israel approved a Declaration of Principles on Palestinian self-government; the Parliament of South Africa enacted legislation establishing the Transitional Executive Council to take charge of that country until a democratically elected Government is in office; and a constitutional Government took office in Cambodia.

We welcome these historic events and the promise they hold for a more just and prosperous existence for the peoples of those nations. As delegations will remember, the Middle East and South Africa dominated the political agenda of the Assembly for many years. These positive developments in both regions will give a new cast to the Assembly's deliberations.

We can also take heart from progress on another front of long-standing concern to the Assembly. The United Nations is now three years into the International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism. The good news is that we are already seeing evidence that the goals and objectives of the United Nations in this area are almost completely realized. The number of Self-Governing Territories on the United Nations list is now very small, and many of these are exploring innovative ways to complete the decolonization process. The recent United Nations Seminar on Colonialism, held in Papua-New Guinea in June, confirmed this trend. It also revealed that in some cases some very small Non-Self-Governing Territories do not want fundamental constitutional change thrust upon them.

New Zealand has always been a strong advocate of the principle that in all cases decisions on self-determination are, of course, for the local people to make. We are comfortable with the notion that certain Territories, such as the Tokelaus, may finally choose to develop concepts of self-government and free association that further develop models that have already been successfully employed for other very small former Territories.

In that connection, and consistent with New Zealand's principled approach to all matters of decolonization, I am pleased to confirm that the New Zealand Government and the people of the Tokelaus have extended an invitation to the United Nations to send a further visiting mission to the Tokelaus early in 1994 to meet local leaders and, of course, discuss recent developments.

Democracy is a sure foundation for peace between nations. It is the political expression of that universal respect for human rights to which we are all committed. The Vienna Declaration and Plan of Action arising out of this year's World Conference on Human Rights gives some direction to steps the Organization can take to strengthen the observance of human rights.

I believe we should move quickly to approve a high commissioner for human rights. The United Nations needs an officer with a mandate to play a constructive role in preventing, monitoring and alleviating human rights abuses throughout the world. The Centre for Human Rights should be given the resources to match the immense task it will have before it. There is a clear need for an enhanced programme of advisory services and technical assistance to help countries build up their national human rights infrastructure.

Human rights is also about recognizing the rights of peoples to self-identity. In this, the International Year for the World's Indigenous People, I would like to support a

proposal that the United Nations declare a decade for indigenous peoples. We need to build on what has been achieved, first at Rio de Janeiro and subsequently during the International Year world wide. This is a long-term task. It will require a sustained and very coordinated effort.

Unhappily, our task is not just to enhance the observance of human rights. In this last decade of the twentieth century, we seem at times to be actually moving backwards, witnessing the abuse and deprivation of human rights on a scale that we really believed we had put a long way behind us. The suffering of millions of refugees displaced by conflict is beyond our comprehension but cannot and should not be beyond our compassion. This dimension is starkly evident in nearly every issue now before the Security Council. Last June, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees put the figure at 19 million people - 19 million displaced people around the world - and it continues to rise.

It is appropriate to pay a special tribute to Mrs. Ogata and her staff for the way in which they are meeting, often in dangerous and trying circumstances, the challenges which this problem brings. New Zealand has responded to these increased demands by making a special provision for refugees from Bosnia, Somalia and Cambodia by establishing special programmes for particularly vulnerable groups, such as women at risk, and by providing aid. We now have one of the highest per capita resettlement ratios in the world. But this is, of course, addressing the symptoms, not the cause. The ultimate objective must be to create or recreate conditions that allow refugees to return in safety and dignity to their own homes and homelands.

Nor can we neglect the need to bring to justice those who have brought about such suffering. The establishment of a war crimes Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia is certainly a central pillar in the international response to this particular conflict. The full achievement of the Tribunal's mandate is of the highest priority. At the same time, and in a broader context, New Zealand also welcomes the consideration being given to the creation of an international criminal court. We would like to see further progress on this issue made during this session of the Assembly.

Sustainable economic growth for all countries is essential for stability and peace in the world. A principal determinant for that is an open, healthy and international trading system, a system that encourages closer economic relations and strengthened North-South exchanges. There is no greater assistance developed countries can give to the developing countries than to open their markets. A satisfactory conclusion to the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations would be of immense benefit to us all and has been mentioned, I believe, by just about every speaker on this rostrum during this debate.

Progress to that end in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, of course, has been slow, as we know. Many deadlines have come and many deadlines have gone without resolution. We should not be under any illusion. Come this December, after seven years of negotiations on the Uruguay Round, either we will have the liberalization of multilateral trade with a benefit to all or the prospects of avoiding global economic warfare will have suffered the most serious setback. The New Zealand Government sees the purpose of these negotiations being to lock in place today the politically attainable, and to build on what might be possible tomorrow. In preparing for that, we also have to focus our attention on what is needed to ensure that all countries are placed where they can reap the benefits of the future.

We still have much to follow up from the Rio Conference on Environment and Development. But time is not on our side. Environmental degradation continues to pose a serious threat to the planet and its resources, and no country - no country - is immune from its impact. The levels of responsibility for environmental damage may differ from country to country, but we must face up to their consequences together. We must meet the objectives of Agenda 21 and the Rio Declaration. All countries should move to ratify the climate and biodiversity Conventions, a step that New Zealand took just recently. New Zealand will contribute to the global environmental facility that is to fund both of those Conventions. We have begun work to reduce carbon dioxide emissions and are developing a comprehensive strategy for reducing net greenhouse gas emissions. We are also making excellent progress on phasing out consumption of ozone-depleting chemicals. New Zealand is ready to share its expertise on biological diversity with other countries to assist them in meeting obligations under the Conventions.

I suppose that one of the most useful exercises that we can conclude here is to draw some lessons from the experiences and views that I have set out. The most obvious one to me is that, however important it is to deal with the particularities of human aspirations for peace, respect for the individual, economic well-being and a good, clean environment, one should never lose sight of the

connections between them all. The Secretary-General has pointed out how peace, development and democracy form a mutually reinforcing circle, and we agree. Getting the linkages right can be as important for success as the elements of each. Peace and security are not likely to be soundly based if people are hungry. Economic growth cannot last if the natural resources used to create it are not conserved. People are not likely to make the effort required by economic restructuring if the important choices are made for them. Economic growth cannot be sustained if countries keep coming up with new pretexts, such as environmental protection, to justify excluding outside competition from their own markets.

Human aspirations and human security must be seen in the round. That is one of the major challenges facing the membership of this Organization. The work done by the United Nations in post-peace-keeping situations, I believe, deserves renewed attention. For those countries where there is still a need to foster economic, political and social development, we should look at establishing a partnership arrangement between the United Nations and the sovereign Government. A coordinating body comprising the Governments and a group of friends of the Secretariat could help to ensure that the gains of peace-keeping are taken through to reconstruction. I believe that we need a new institutional framework to graduate problems out of the security area and into a forum more able to cope with the needs of redevelopment and reconstruction.

The second lesson is that we need to keep looking at how well the United Nations is fitted to meet the challenges it is facing and be prepared to change it where necessary. Membership of the United Nations has continued to grow and I warmly welcome the newest Member States.

Many speakers have referred to Security Council reform. The Security Council is in need of early reform. We support a modest increase in membership and a fresh look at the institution as a whole. The possibility of some members representing regional groupings for, say, a 10-year period is worth considering. New Zealand will continue to oppose any extension of veto rights.

Another imperative is for the Council's work methods to be improved. Wider consultation with the broader membership of the United Nations is essential. United Nations agencies are also ripe for restructuring. The General Assembly has made a good start on itself. We have streamlined the Committees, but we also must streamline the overall workload. It is unmanageable at present.

For several years now, we have been looking hard at ways to fund new demands on the Organization by making compensating savings elsewhere. We still need to ask hard questions about whether all that has been done traditionally still needs to be done. I welcome the fact that the Secretary-General's budget proposals already envisage some major steps in this area. He has also identified better contracting as a source of further savings.

At the end of the day, however, all that can be done to increase efficiency and cut costs will come to naught if the financial commitment by Member States is lacking. New Zealand pays its dues on time; most others do not. I urge them to do so. Let us certainly go on talking about financial reform, but let us also secure the financial basis of the Organization while we are doing so.

But what is the real dream that all of us have? I would urge all members to keep making, from year to year, real progress towards satisfying those basic human aspirations I mentioned at the outset and to do so with a strong, well-equipped and well-focused United Nations. Specifically, I want to see a reshaped Security Council, a more tightly focused General Assembly, better peace-keeping practice, a Secretariat equipped to handle peace-building and partnership arrangements, and financial arrangements built on efficiency and punctuality. Would that not give a point to the fiftieth anniversary celebrations that lie ahead in 1995, and would it not make the United Nations of the next 50 years a more effective, more dynamic and exciting place to do the world's business in than the conditions of the last 50 years have allowed? The deprived of this world expect no less. The well-off know the world is too small for the huge gap that now exists amongst all people to remain.

Mr. DOSSOU (Benin) (interpretation from French): On behalf of the delegation of Benin and on behalf of the Government and the people of Benin, I should like to extend my warm congratulations to Ambassador Insanally on his well-deserved election to the presidency of the General Assembly at this session. His unanimous election as leader of our deliberations testifies to his abilities; it is also represents an honour for his country and draws attention to the role played by Caribbean countries in the international arena.

I take this opportunity to extend my sincere congratulations to his predecessor, Mr. Stoyan Ganev, who

ably presided over the work of the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session.

It is also a great pleasure and a privilege for me to pay a well-deserved tribute to Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, Secretary-General of the United Nations, who effectively and successfully heads this global Organization and who is working intensively to restore peace and security to the various hotbeds of tension throughout the world.

The delegation of Benin solemnly welcomes the new States that have joined the world community to make their contribution to respect for the common basic values of the new society which together, we, the people of the world, are endeavouring to build. I welcome the Czech Republic, the Slovak Republic, Eritrea, the Principality of Monaco and the Principality of Andorra, whose admission enhances the universality of this Organization.

We are meeting here, as we do each year under similar circumstances, to consider together ways and means of promoting peace and prosperity for all our peoples.

Since the last session of the General Assembly, we have witnessed many important events that have given the international community as a whole new prospects and new challenges in its quest for peace.

We welcome the fact that the confrontation between the two blocs, which for so long had created political tension, has today been replaced by the universal values of democracy and equality in international relations. These values are interdependent with economic and social development and with the security of all States.

It is also encouraging to see that renewed confidence in the effectiveness of the United Nations in settling conflicts has strengthened the credibility and the capacity to act of the Organization, opening up new areas in which it is able to encourage the settlement of a vast range of problems that afflict humankind.

In just five years, the tasks of the Organization in the area of maintaining peace have increased and widened considerably.

Despite positive developments, changes currently under way that were designed to provide for greater freedom and encourage the establishment of more just and more dynamic societies have unfortunately also become the source of new challenges and even greater uncertainty in international relations. Each day, in one place or another on our planet, civil wars, territorial partition, ethnic confrontations and tribal or religious struggles demand the urgent intervention of the United Nations.

We can see, therefore, how difficult is the task of the Organization, which is obliged to respect a fragile balance between the sovereignty of States and the duty to intervene.

In Europe, the political picture has changed dramatically in just a few years. The hopes born of the disappearance of the Berlin Wall have been virtually dashed by another, anachronistic war in the former Yugoslavia and by the situation in some of the States that emerged from the disintegration of the Soviet Union, thus threatening stability and security on the old continent.

In Africa, major civil wars continue to rage. These wars are responsible for the untold suffering and destruction which are hampering efforts at socio-economic development and recovery in our continent.

Africa needs peace and security. Without them the courageous and far-reaching reforms undertaken at the political and economic levels cannot be successful.

The twenty-ninth summit of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) held in Cairo in June of this year provided us with an opportunity to adopt a mechanism for the prevention, management and settlement of conflicts. That mechanism is an important step forward in the acceptance of the imperative of peace, which is so essential to development. Indeed, conflict management remains a major concern for our countries, as the massive movements of refugees that result from conflicts distract us, to our sorrow, from the paramount task of development.

West Africa, which until now has been a peaceful land of asylum, welcoming refugees from the rest of the continent and even beyond, is now living through a particularly difficult time, with an unprecedented increase in emergency situations and in the number of refugees, which in less than four years has risen from 20,000 to 1.2 million.

Here, I would pay a tribute to the humanitarian activities and the considerable efforts of the United Nations to settle conflicts in Africa and elsewhere in the world.

Because of the support of the United Nations, the Liberian conflict today offers encouraging prospects for a peaceful and lasting settlement. The major protagonists in the Liberian tragedy now seem disposed towards dialogue and agreement. They met in Geneva from 10 to 17 July 1993, with the help of representatives of the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity and the Executive Secretariat of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and of the Acting President of that Community, to seek ways and means of silencing the weapons of war and restoring peace to their country. Those present at the Geneva meeting successfully prepared a comprehensive agreement that takes account of all aspects of the Liberian tragedy.

In Cotonou on 25 July 1993, representatives of the various factions and of the interim Government of Liberia signed that peace agreement, thanks to the mediation of Mr. Nicéphore Soglo, President of the Republic of Benin, and Acting President of ECOWAS. Benin is pleased by the willingness of our Liberian brothers to enter into this agreement and by their spirit of constructive and fraternal dialogue, without which nothing positive could have been achieved. Benin continues to believe that dialogue is the only way of restoring peace to this war-torn country.

We welcome the positive results thus far achieved in the implementation of the agreement, most notably the observation of the cease-fire by all the warring factions and the cessation of hostilities.

In particular, the delegation of Benin welcomes the unanimous adoption by the Security Council of resolution 856 (1993), which supports the efforts of ECOWAS and approves the deployment in Liberia of an advance team of 30 military observers to participate in the work of the Joint Cease-fire Monitoring Committee. We also welcome resolution 866 (1993), which establishes the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia (UNOMIL).

This Mission can be made possible only by a mobilization of the international community to support the efforts of ECOWAS by, *inter alia*, contributing to the special trust fund, which would facilitate the dispatch of reinforcements to ECOMOG by the African States and help provide for the upkeep of the contingents made available to ECOMOG by the participating States, as well as by helping in carrying out the work of removing mines, providing humanitarian and developmental assistance and promoting the healthy evolution of the electoral process.

The three signatories of the 25 July 1993 peace agreement met in Cotonou from 15 to 18 August 1993 to set up the Council of State, the transitional executive body. The 25 July peace agreement promises finally to put an end to the very long, devastating war in Liberia.

From this rostrum, I would like to make an appeal to all the parties who signed that agreement, urging them to continue to abide by the commitments entered into during the Cotonou talks and to work with ECOWAS and the United Nations for the proper and swift implementation of those commitments, in order to put an end to the suffering of the Liberian people and ensure that the national reconciliation process will proceed to its successful completion.

Along the lines of the solution under way in Liberia, we should work to ensure that peace returns to Somalia, Angola, the Sudan and Mozambique.

In Angola, for example, despite the great hopes and expectations aroused by the agreements reached in Estoril, Portugal, we are seriously disturbed and deeply saddened by the resumption of hostilities following the refusal of UNITA to recognize the results of the free elections of 29 and 30 September 1992.

Benin welcomes the change in the position taken by the United States Government, which has now granted diplomatic recognition to the legal Government of Angola. This action by the Clinton Administration strengthens the position of the international community in support of the verdict of the ballot box rather than the compulsion of the gun.

In South Africa, developments are encouraging. The multipartite talks made it possible to reach an agreement on, *inter alia*, the establishment of a transitional executive council and the holding of the first democratic and non-racial elections in the history of South Africa, scheduled for 27 April 1994.

The Government of Benin supports the courageous and responsible appeal by the Chairman of the African National Congress, Mr. Nelson Mandela, before the Special Committee against Apartheid in this prestigious Hall of the General Assembly on 24 September 1993. He invited the international community to lift all economic sanctions against South Africa, except for the arms embargo. Given the positive development that will lead this country, which is undergoing a process of reform, to implement the principle of "one man, one vote", the time has come for all

Members of our universal Organization to support the peaceful transformation of South Africa.

Benin wishes to see the African continent free itself of all fratricidal and internal wars, of all conflicts that impede its development. It is my firm hope that the logic of war will now progressively yield to the logic of peace and development in Africa.

Turning to the Middle East, 26 years after Israel's occupation of the Arab territories, Benin cannot but greet with joy the historic agreement between the Israeli Government and the Palestine Liberation Organization granting autonomy to Gaza and Jericho.

That agreement marks the beginning of a just and lasting peace that will allow every State in the region, including Palestine and Israel, to live within secure and internationally recognized borders guaranteed by the international community. Our duty is thus to encourage the two essential parties, as well as all parties involved, to undertake or to continue the dialogue necessary for a comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

In the Persian Gulf region the full restoration of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Kuwait helped to reaffirm the fundamental principles governing inter-State relations. In this connection we sincerely hope that Security Council resolution 833 (1993), on the demarcation of the international border between Iraq and Kuwait, will be respected by all States. Pending issues such as that of the Kuwaiti prisoners of war must be settled so as to open the way to fraternity, cooperation and solidarity in that subregion.

The atmosphere of relaxation of tension which began with the end of the cold war and which has made possible a new spirit of consensus, *inter alia* in the Security Council, is still rather uncertain for much remains to be done to consolidate peace.

We must recognize today that the idea of peace can no longer be based on a build-up of weapons; it must be based, rather, on concerted efforts on their reduction and complete elimination. The balance of terror is now yielding to a meeting of the minds, the hearts and the actions of man.

That is why the signing of the United Nations Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, in Paris on 13-15 January 1993, not only helps to strengthen international peace and security but also offers prospects for international cooperation in the area of using the chemicals industry for peaceful purposes.

Benin, which is dedicated to peace and economic and social progress, urges the international community to refrain from any military use of science so that science can be devoted to development, and international peace and security.

The decision by Russia, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France to extend their moratorium on nuclear testing until September 1994 proves that the Governments of those nuclear Powers are increasingly interested in measures that will make it possible to use scientific and technical developments exclusively for peaceful purposes.

My country joins the rest of the international community in congratulating the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on the reversal of its decision to withdraw from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), for that withdrawal from the Treaty would only have weakened it, given that its strength lies in its universality.

The determination shown by Member States to move towards the solution of regional conflicts and the new sense of urgency over new threats to the well-being of the planet create a historic opportunity for us to tackle the economic problems facing all of our countries.

Indeed, this forty-eighth session of the General Assembly is taking place against a background of general economic crisis. In the new economic order which is characterized by increased trade between three dominant groups - Western Europe, North America and the Pacific-Asia zone - Africa is virtually left out.

The developed North seems to have less and less need of Africa's products and Africa for its part no longer has the means to buy the goods and services of the North. What is more, the international community does not seem very anxious to find a better way of dealing with the African countries' debt burden.

This situation cannot but lead to a slowing down in trade on the world market and directly affect African economies which are already suffering.

In these circumstances our survival necessarily requires sustained regional integration so that we can be in a better position to deal with the vicissitudes of the international economic environment and take up the challenge of how to develop our own continent.

In his "An Agenda for Peace" the Secretary-General emphasized the role of regional organizations in establishing peace and preventive diplomacy. This role naturally extends to development too. We cannot overemphasize the importance of integration for development.

In the case of Africa such integration is a means of encouraging trade, investment, and research and development cooperation among African countries.

That is why the Heads of State or Government of the members of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), meeting in Cotonou from 22 to 24 July 1993, adopted and signed a revised Treaty of the Economic Community of West African States and reaffirmed their determination to bring a new dynamism to the process of regional integration.

If the development of Africa is primarily the responsibility of the Africans themselves, it is no less important for the international community to recognize the principle of shared responsibility and full partnership with Africa.

In this connection we should note that the implementation of the United Nations New Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s is not living up to all the hopes that the African countries placed in it. It is necessary further to strengthen national capacities and to create a climate that is favourable to development.

While Benin welcomes the study on the need and the feasibility of the establishment of a fund to diversify African commodities, we strongly hope that bolder action will be taken with a view to implementing the new programme and ensuring the input of the major financial contributions which are necessary for the establishment of the fund in 1994.

Hence we must increase the quality and the quantity of assistance to Africa.

In this spirit Benin will in a few days be participating in the Tokyo International Conference on African Development. This Conference, to be held against the backdrop of the new world economic and political order of the post-cold-war era, will provide the international community with a new framework for discussing how to reaffirm the question of Africa's economic development as one of the major concerns of the world today.

Our hope, widely shared by African countries, is that the Conference, apart from adopting a declaration, will actually lead to specific actions and commitments in support of Africa.

The African countries also hope that the Tokyo Declaration of 9 July 1993 of the Group of Seven industrialized countries - which was designed to replace the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank Structural Adjustment Programme with another mechanism that would be better adapted to the conditions and realities of developing countries - will soon take effect.

If this new mechanism is to have some hope of succeeding, it will have to be drawn up following consultations with the countries that are actually experiencing the harsh social consequences of the Structural Adjustment Programme.

If we are to win this wager for development, to which Africa aspires, we have to involve women and children, who represent the majority of the populations of our countries, and so, above all, we have to educate and train young people and adults.

In this connection, the Government of the Republic of Benin is actively preparing for the International Year of the Family in 1994. We shall also be participating with great interest in the International Conference on Population and Development, to be held in Cairo from 5 to 13 September 1994. In addition, we wish to make a real contribution to the preparatory work for the World Conference on Women, which will be held in Beijing in 1995.

The fact that these various conferences are to be held shows that matters relating to social development are eliciting unprecedented interest in the world. This can also be seen from the decision to convene a World Summit for Social Development in 1995. This renewal of interest is motivated by the profound changes in the social and political situation in the world, and the shifting of priorities at the State level.

Democracy cannot become stronger unless there is at least a minimum level of prosperity for peoples. One obstacle to this strengthening of democracy and thus the full development of human rights is poverty, the poverty in which the majority of our populations live.

The right to development has been ignored for too long. It must now be regarded as a priority right, a sacred right. This right to development is the right to dignity, to personal development, and is not compatible with the subhuman status afflicting millions of human beings, particularly in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean.

The right to development is a human right and a national right, and that is why we welcome the conclusions of the World Conference on Human Rights, which was held in Vienna from 14 to 25 June 1993. That Conference certainly marked the beginning of a new era which, we trust, will witness the gradual elimination of the current international economic order, in which two thirds of mankind cannot meet their basic needs and in which 600 million human beings are living in almost absolute poverty. The elimination of such poverty is one of the basic objectives of Agenda 21. The establishment of an International Day for the Eradication of Poverty, the first of which will be celebrated on 17 October next, is one step in this direction.

We can never say often enough that the major ecological problems facing our countries today have a planetary dimension that requires a world-wide approach. This is why the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, held in Rio in June 1992, made sustainable development one of the major concerns of the international community.

That Conference marked a turning-point in the way that we look at our future. It must now be approached in an integrated manner as we work on our development policies.

Agenda 21, the basic document that emerged from that Conference, is an enormous programme of action for the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. It requires Governments to adopt national strategies focused on sustainable development, in close cooperation with the private and public sectors.

Here I am happy to draw attention to the major importance my country attaches to follow-up of the decisions and recommendations of Rio. Benin welcomes the establishment of the Commission on Sustainable Development, which held its first session here in New York from 14 to 25 June 1993, and we welcome the work of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee for the elaboration of an international convention to combat desertification in those countries experiencing serious drought and/or desertification, particularly in Africa. That Committee has already met, from 24 May to 3 June 1993 in Nairobi and from 13 to 24 September 1993 in Geneva.

Pursuant to the Rio recommendations, on 9 to 13 August 1993 Benin held a national seminar on follow-up strategies to implement the results of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, including consideration of chapter 12 of Agenda 21, on how to combat desertification and the impact of drought. The seminar was held at a time when the international community and the development partners of the third world countries were fully involved in thinking about what strategies should be used to make this concept of sustainable development operational. This seminar was proof of the political will of the Government of Benin to abide by the commitments we entered into at Rio.

The Cotonou seminar recommended, *inter alia*, the establishment of a national commission on sustainable development. A drafting committee for a national Agenda 21, the major guidelines for which were decided on by the seminar, has been set up. It should finish its work by the end of this year.

In two years, we shall be celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations.

The years that have passed since 1945 have been marked by ongoing, fundamental change and by a considerable increase in the membership of the Organization as well as by a significant widening of the Organization's area of activity.

It is thus obvious that the Organization needs to be restructured to meet our world's current requirements. This is why Benin supports the efforts under way to restructure and revitalize the United Nations in its economic and social sectors and related areas.

In the view of the delegation of Benin, the reform should be designed to ensure better coordination of the activities of the United Nations and wiser utilization of its human and financial resources.

Benin, while still open to dialogue in negotiations, endorses the view of the Group of 77, particularly on the question of how to allocate seats on the governing bodies of bodies such as the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Fund for Population Activities and the United Nations Children's Fund.

In the political area, my country is willing to consider all proposals that take account of the concerns and interests of all the various actors, large and small, in the international political arena at the end of this second millennium.

Reform of the Security Council is a matter of particular importance to all Member States. Benin will follow closely any proposal for reform that might strengthen the effectiveness of the Council and avoid transforming it into a forum for sterile debate or logjams or into an instrument that benefits only a privileged few.

Before I conclude my statement, I should like to recall that if we wish to approach the next millennium in tranquillity, if we wish to draw satisfaction from the efforts made so far along the tortuous and difficult path towards development, we must do everything possible to give more sustained attention to the principle of world-wide partnership and the duty to show solidarity which is necessarily implied by the new international order that now governs the international community.

It is Benin's wish that mankind, when it draws up its first balance sheet of this new era, should see a drop in the number of ills that continue to undermine the twentieth century, namely poverty, famine, endemic diseases such as malaria, the AIDS pandemic and its devastating human, social and economic consequences, illiteracy, environmental degradation, underdevelopment, and all those other ills that beset us.

In an increasingly interdependent world, and faced with this challenge, nations must agree to yield part - only part - of their national sovereignty to our universal human values, and to show greater determination to coexist despite cultural, political, social and economic differences. Only in that way can the world of the twenty-first century be a more hospitable one for people, wherever they may live and whoever they may be.

The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in the general debate for this meeting.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I remind members that statements in the exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and five minutes for the second intervention, and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. ANSARI (India): I wish, under rule 73 of the rules of procedure, to refer to the statement made earlier today by the representative of Pakistan.

All the water in the East River cannot wash off the stains of falsehood, prejudice and perversion with which the Foreign Minister of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan defaced this lofty forum. His eloquence is matched only by his sophistry, and the two together constitute an impressive exercise in high-pitched salesmanship of a product whose shelf-life is ending, if it has not ended.

The representative of Pakistan sought to assume an air of injured innocence. He would have us believe that he has been forced into combat without even a sword in his hand. The truth, however, is that he does not stand in need of a sword. He is instead making use of every weapon available in the arsenal of modern-day terrorism. His Government's role in recruiting, training, funding and arming terrorists and abetting their infiltration into the Indian states of Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir is well known to Governments, the international media and human rights organizations.

Very recently a report by Asia Watch gave ample facts and figures to substantiate what it called "the Pakistan conduit" being used by these terrorists. The "conduit" is not for moral support, as is claimed so innocently by Pakistan. It is instead a well established channel for injecting deadly hardware into the territory of India. Clinching evidence of this was provided by the United States Department of State report on global terrorism for the year 1991, and by a Department of State spokesman on 8 January 1993.

Matters have deteriorated to such an extent that the United States Government considered in all seriousness declaring Pakistan a State sponsor of terrorism. This is evident from an extract from a letter dated 2 August 1993 which the State Department wrote to the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the United States House of Representatives, which reads as follows:

> "If there is any subsequent resurgence of official support for those who commit terrorist acts against

India, either directly or through private groups, the Secretary of State will not hesitate to name Pakistan a State sponsor of terrorism.

"...

"In any case, the Secretary of State will review this issue again not later than December this year".

Pakistan's commitment to the cause of promoting terrorism does not stop at this. It has gone further, to ensure that this terrorism is "sustainable". It has done so by establishing a deep nexus between terrorism and the trade in narcotic drugs. The present caretaker Government of Pakistan published only the other day a list of some of their more prominent narcotics barons. It reads like a "Who's Who" of that noble land. If further evidence is needed of the Pakistani hand, it is readily available in countries such as Egypt, Tunisia and Algeria, where Pakistani-trained terrorists of the Peshawar school have been wreaking havoc.

It would thus seem that the crocodile tears the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has shed before this Assembly are really in support of his extraordinary plea that world opinion should accept Pakistan's actions as the principal promoter of narco-terrorism in the world. From this unacceptable premise the Government of Pakistan wishes to argue that it should not only be allowed a free hand to violate with impunity the basic human rights of ordinary citizens, of men, women and children, but should also be proclaimed the protector of the human rights of the very terrorists who are violating every norm of civilized existence.

The verdict of the jury on this strange plea is clear and unambiguous. It is incorporated into paragraph 17 of the Vienna Declaration adopted after the World Conference on Human Rights in June this year. The words of that paragraph are worth recalling:

"The acts, methods and practices of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations as well as linkage in some countries to drug trafficking are activities aimed at the destruction of human rights, fundamental freedoms and democracy, threatening territorial integrity, security of States and destabilizing legitimately constituted Governments. The international community should take the necessary steps to enhance cooperation to prevent and combat terrorism." *(A/CONF.157/23, para. 17)*

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan also sought to regale us today by replaying an old, worn-out gramophone record on the question of self-determination. It would be charitable to characterize his remarks as half-truths. In reality, however, they cloak a nefarious design aimed at the territorial integrity of India. He conveniently ignores the fact that the debate on the concept of self-determination was settled in the United Nations long ago. The concept itself relates to people under colonial or alien domination or foreign occupation. It specifically does not permit action which would dismember or impair, totally or in part, the territorial integrity or political unity of States. This is spelled out conclusively and unambiguously in paragraph 2 of the Vienna Declaration I cited earlier.

The state of Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India. The validity of its accession to India, both legally and through the popular will, is uncontestable. Rather, it is Pakistan that is the aggressor and is to this day in unlawful occupation of a part of Jammu and Kashmir. The only issue that remains to be resolved, therefore, is the vacation by Pakistan of that aggression.

It is a matter of history that in the past 46 years Pakistan has committed aggression against India on three different occasions. After each setback it committed itself to solemn agreements, multilaterally or bilaterally. The commitments undertaken therein were forsaken soon thereafter. The excuse in each case was a yearning for something not legally Pakistan's, the justification always pegged to a nebulous principle that it never practised in regard to its own people in any part of its own territory.

The Foreign Minister spoke of the sanctity of international agreements; he chose not to mention the Simla Agreement signed between our two countries in 1972, which has provided the framework for the conduct of bilateral relations. In that agreement, both countries undertook not to interfere in each other's internal affairs, to prevent hostile propaganda, and also to prevent the organization, assistance or encouragement of any acts detrimental to the maintenance of peace and harmonious relations. Both countries further undertook to resolve their differences by peaceful means, through bilateral negotiations.

Instead of implementing these provisions, the Government of Pakistan decided, around the year 1984, to conduct a proxy war against my country through the organization of large-scale terrorism in the border states of Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir. A report published on 1 February 1993 by the Republican Research Committee

of the United States House of Representatives traces in graphic detail the manner in which the Pakistan Government agencies have involved themselves in the training of terrorists and their infiltration into India.

India is thus the principal victim of these criminals; however, it is not the only one. A report in *The New York Times* on 11 August 1993 by its correspondent in Peshawar attributes to the concerned officials of the United States the view that

> "some of the men, and much of the inspiration, for the bombing of the World Trade Center in New York in February and for a second bombing conspiracy ... in New York in June" *("Where Arab Militants Train and Wait", The New York Times, 11 August 1993, p. A8)*

came from Peshawar. The global dimensions of the matter are thus evident.

This, then, is the record. It speaks for itself. The conclusion is inescapable that such an approach to relations with a neighbouring country is contrary to norms of civilized behaviour, self-defeating and certainly not conducive to common well-being.

India, on its part, wishes well to Pakistan and its people. Our two peoples are linked by ties of blood, history and culture and must take into account the economic imperatives of a common region. The people and the Government of India extend once again the hand of friendship to the people and Government of Pakistan, in the expectation that they will see fit to make a new beginning and give shape to the vision of a great Indian poet, Mohammad Iqbal, whom Pakistan regards as its national poet. I translate the couplet,

> "Come, let us lift the veil of otherness, bring together estranged ones,
>
> Erase the signs of strangeness".

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): Let me respond to this spewing of hatred which we have just heard from the distinguished representative of India. Not only has he robbed the people of Kashmir of their land, now he also wishes to rob Pakistan of its national poet.

Jammu and Kashmir is not an integral part of India. Security Council resolution 47 (1948), notes the desire of India and Pakistan that "the question of the accession of Jammu and Kashmir to India or Pakistan should be decided through the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite" *(fourth preambular paragraph)*.

This call for a plebiscite was reiterated in Security Council resolutions 91 (1951) and 122 (1957), among others, and resolutions of the United Nations Commission on India and Pakistan, specifically its resolutions of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949. India has refused to implement these resolutions.

The United Nations maps - the official documents of the United Nations - all indicate that Jammu and Kashmir is disputed territory. Kashmir is on the agenda of the Security Council. The Secretary-General's latest report mentions Jammu and Kashmir as a question that has to be resolved between India and Pakistan. The oldest United Nations peace-keeping operation, the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP), has been stationed on the line of control in Jammu and Kashmir since 1949. So much for Kashmir being an integral part of India.

The Simla Agreement did not change the status of Kashmir. The Simla Agreement called for a final settlement of Jammu and Kashmir through bilateral negotiations or any other means agreed between the parties. Pakistan has sought to pursue bilateral negotiations with India. We wrote to the Prime Minister of India in 1992 at the level of our Prime Minister. The response was to shut the door in our face. India has refused to discuss Kashmir in bilateral negotiations.

The distinguished representative of India has said that the self-determination in Kashmir would erode the territorial integrity of India. Territorial integrity applies only to territory that is part of States, not to territories which are disputed, territories whose status has not been determined. India has been in colonial occupation of Kashmir since 1947. It deserves to be treated as a colonial Power. A people struggling against colonial occupation for their right to self-determination is entitled to struggle by all means possible.

India has attempted to tarnish the Kashmiri struggle by depicting it as terrorism. Pakistan condemns terrorism. Terrorism implies senseless violence against innocent people. But when a people is subjected to foreign occupation, when its homes are invaded, its sons are shot and its women are raped, does it not have the right to take

up arms in self-defence? As one Kashmiri businessman is quoted by *The Los Angeles Times* of 29 August,

> "Now it is a question of survival. Now they go into our homes and shoot our children. ... I am a grandfather, and sometimes I feel I must pick up a gun."

If the Kashmiris are terrorists, then so were all those brave sons and daughters who struggled against colonialism by all means at their disposal and won freedom for the vast majority of the States represented in this Hall tonight. If the Kashmiris are terrorists, then most of the States represented here are the products of terrorism.

The recent human-rights Conference in Vienna took special note of the particular situation of peoples under colonial and other forms of alien domination or foreign occupation, and recognized their right to take any legitimate action, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, to realize their inalienable right to self-determination. India's campaign in Kashmir constitutes State terrorism. The Non-Aligned Summit in Jakarta described the suppression of a people's struggle for self-determination as the worst form of terrorism, and what it means to the Kashmiris is torture. I quote a report of the International Federation of Lawyers for Human Rights:

> "People, mainly young men, are tortured in Kashmir every day. ... there is exhaustive evidence gathered by the local human-rights workers, lawyers and doctors to support this assertion ... The methods employed are barbaric, inhuman and unimaginably vicious. Detainees are beaten with rods or lathis; they are whipped with flexible cable; they are subjected to electric shock treatment ...".

I shall not go any further; it is too beastly to be recounted in this forum.

Amnesty International: "Torture is practised systematically in Jammu and Kashmir."

Rape: this afternoon we referred to Kunan Poshpora. On 10 October 1992 the village of Chak Saidapara was the site of another mass rape by the Indian army. The Asia Watch report says that as the conflict in Kashmir enters its fourth year, central and state authorities have done little to stop the widespread practice of rape by Indian security forces. Arson has been a weapon in India's counter-insurgency strategy in Kashmir since 1990.

Massacre: Sopura, 6 January 1993. Batekote, 1 October 1992. Nasrullahpora, 13 July 1992. The list is endless.

The representative of India has chosen to speak of Pakistan in terms that have been borrowed from a lexicon that one should not use against one's neighbour. Let me remind him that in Pakistan we have a functioning democracy. No part of Pakistan is under emergency rule, like Kashmir. Unlike India, we do not have pogroms in Pakistan. One hundred thousand Muslims have perished in acts of religious frenzy and communal violence in India since 1947. In Pakistan we not only profess democracy, we also practice it. We do not, like India, pretend to be perfect. But we are certainly better than India, a country which is fast emerging as the sick man of Asia, riven by internal dissensions, divided into castes, classes and nationalities, surging with irrational and murderous forces of Hindu fundamentalism, ruled by indecision and ambiguity, prone to bullying its neighbours and with a proclivity to the use of force; a country which has engaged in 17 different wars since its independence, the highest number for any State represented in this Hall.

The PRESIDENT: May I remind members that statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to five minutes for the second intervention.

I now call on the representative of India.

Mr. ANSARI (India): We are constrained to speak a second time.

The representative of Pakistan has added nothing either to the knowledge or to the perception of this Assembly. His remarks call to mind another couplet of the poet Iqbal, who, incidentally, was born an Indian and died an Indian: "He participates not in serious quest, but opts eagerly for blind emulation". My delegation considers it unnecessary to add to this very apt description.

The meeting rose at 9:30 p.m.